

# The Classical Review

MAY, 1938

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE first International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy will be held in Amsterdam, beginning on August 31. The Secretary of the Committee of Organization is Mr J. J. E. Hondius (Valeriusplein 15, Amsterdam).

The ninth volume of the Dutch *Klassieke Bibliographie* (for particulars of which see *C.R.* LI. 50) professes to cover the year 1937. So far as *C.R.* is concerned, this is an idle boast; of the thirty-three articles and notes which were published in *C.R.* LI, only twelve are recorded by *K.B.* In spite of what was said here last year, Mr. Tate's work again lurks under the heading 'Atheismus'; 'Bucolica' and 'Eclogae' are separate sub-headings under 'Virgilius'; 'Humanisti', 'Substantium Latinum' and 'Discus Phaesti' all appear both in the text and in the index.

Latin has always flourished in Hungary, and it is little more than a century since it ceased to be officially used in the Diet; how important a part it plays in Hungarian education today is shown by the vitality of *Juventus*, a Latin monthly magazine for schools, edited and published in Budapest. *Juventus* attained its majority last year and, to judge from the list of juvenile contributors, enjoys a wide circulation not only in Hungary but also in other parts of the Continent. Among its staple features are news pages (the number of last June has an illustrated account of our Coronation), articles on history and geography, literature and sports, 'iocosa' and 'librorum recensio'; besides these there are puzzles, poems, *Hyphatia* as a Latin serial, and a page of lighter fare 'lectoribus minimis'. The subscription price is 4 pengö; free specimen copies will be sent by the management, 5 Barcsay-Utca, Budapest 7.

Dr. G. Italie announces that he intends to publish a Lexicon Euripideum containing all the words occurring in

NO. CCCLXXIII. VOL. LII.

Euripides, with contexts where they are necessary. He has already collected a considerable amount of material, and now invites the assistance of others who are interested in the project. While he will be grateful for advice of any kind, he would especially welcome copies of papers dealing with the fragments of Euripides. His address is Roelofsstraat 18, The Hague.

Poems for the Hoeufft Medal of 1939 must reach Amsterdam by December 31 of this year. For directions to competitors see *C.R.* XLIX. 117.

The first number of *The Link, A Review of Mediaeval and Modern Greek*, edited by Dr. Nicholas Bachtin, is to appear in May. The new magazine's main object is 'to interpret the past of Greece through its present and its present through the past, and thus to reveal the basic unity of Greek civilisation in all its manifestations and throughout its whole development'. Contributions dealing with the classical period may be included 'provided that this period is not treated as a closed and self-sufficient whole, but as a link'. The list of articles to appear in the first three issues is various and attractive. Mr. Blackwell of Oxford is the publisher; the annual subscription, for three numbers, is a guinea; and a single number costs 7s. 6d.

To the bibliographies of Greek authors which have appeared in the Belgian magazine *Les Études Classiques* the April number (Tome VII—No. 2) adds ten pages on Thucydides which have the merits that we have come to expect; but, to repeat some words from *C.R.* LI. 161, 'if one must find a fault, it is that too little is said of editions of single books'. Though Marchant's five volumes are duly mentioned, other such English and American editions from which the student can draw good help are passed over. Of larger works,

D

Arnold's complete edition, after the lapse of a century, still deserves mention if only for the sake of its maps and plans; and Jowett's translation must not be ignored. In making these comments we recognize the international value of these bibliographies, and pay

them the compliment of criticism from the point of view which we can most properly represent. If the editors have thoughts of revising them for publication in pamphlet form, perhaps they might seek a little friendly co-operation from abroad.

### EURIPIDES H.F. 497 sqq.

ΑΜΦ. σὸν μὲν τὰ νέρθεν εὐτρεπῆ ποιοῦ, γύναι·  
ἔγώ δε σέ, οὐ Ζεῦ, χεῖρ' ἐς οὐρανὸν δικών  
αὐδῶ, τέκνουσιν εἰ τι ποιοῖς; ὀφελεῖν  
μελλεῖς, δύνανται, ὡς τάχ' οὐδὲν ἀρκέσεις.  
κατοικήσασι πολλάκις· πάλτην ποιῶ·  
θανεῖν γάρ, ὡς τοις', ἀναγκαῖος ἔχει.

IN 497 εὐτρεπῆ is the reading of L's second hand and of P: L first wrote εὐπρεπῆ, almost certainly a mere slip.

All modern editors and translators, with one exception, to which I shall return at the end of this paper, seem to agree, so far as they commit themselves, about the general sense of 497. It is taken to mean 'Lady, the death-rites duly order thou' (Way), 'Occupe-toi des apprêts funèbres, ma fille' (Pammentier).

One objection to this view is the sense assigned to τὰ νέρθεν. Out of the 36 other instances of νέρθε(ν) and ἔνερθε(ν) which I have found in tragedy, only one shows the word combined as here with the neuter of the article, I.A. 1250 sq.

τὰ φῶς τόδι ἀνθρώποισιν ἡδιστον βλέπειν,  
τὰ νέρθε δι οὐδέν.

but there are many examples of οἱ νέρθεν and the like, with or without substantives (e.g. δαίμονες, φίλοι). In these instances, and in all others in tragedy, νέρθε(ν) and ἔνερθε(ν) refer directly to the world below, or to its powers or denizens, except for two passages where places underground, other than Hell, are in point, and three where the reference is to local relations on the earth's surface. None of these passages lends any obvious support to current translations of τὰ νέρθεν in H.F. 497. These translations are perhaps just defensible if we suppose, with Joshua Barnes, that the words mean *quae ad inferos pertinent*, but their more natural sense is simply 'Hell' or 'the powers of Hell'.

Consideration of the context must strengthen suspicion that the line is misunderstood. The last seven lines of Megara's speech (490-496), which immediately precede those which I have quoted, consist of a desperate appeal to Herakles, assumed to be certainly dead, to appear, even as a ghost, and scatter her cowardly oppressors. It is surely strange that Amphitryon, himself about to appeal in the same spirit to Zeus, should ignore Megara's outburst, and merely tell her to get on with preparations for death. Wilamowitz shifted 502 (θανεῖν γάρ, ὡς ἔοικ, ἀναγκαῖος ἔχει) to a place between 497 and 498, and this transposition certainly makes 497 (on the received view of its meaning) less abrupt, but it leaves many difficulties untouched. His objections to 502 as it stands in the manuscripts ('wo der vers überliefert ist . . . ist weder die anknüpfung mit γάρ, noch die restriction ὡς ἔοικ, irgendwie zu verstehen') seem frivolous.

What would naturally be expected, between Megara's call to Herakles and Amphitryon's call to Zeus, is rather 'Tu flecte Acheronta, ego superos mouebo'. Doubtless some such interpretation of 497 would long since have been offered but for the words εὐτρεπῆ ποιοῦ, which have always been taken to mean 'make ready' or 'prepare'.

Musgrave, remarking 'Quomodo Megara quae ad inferos pertinebant expedit posset nemo dixerit', confidently proposed 'εὐμενῆ ποιοῦ. Tu quidem ut Inferi nobis propitiis sint cura'. He did not, however, mean these words to refer to Megara's appeal to Herakles, for he goes on 'Fuit utique Graecorum mos ut qui brevi se morituros scirent precibus sese diis Inferis commendarent'. Buckley adopted Musgrave's

reading, suggesting *πρευμενή* as an alternative.

I suggest that the required sense can legitimately be extracted from the manuscript reading. I cannot, indeed, point to any instance of the adjective *εὐτρεπής* in the meaning which I require, but the verb *εὐτρεπίζω*, which in most of its usages is closely equivalent to *ποιῶ* with an accusative of *εὐτρεπής*, provides, both in active and middle, a rare but classical meaning which exactly meets the case.

The best examples known to me are in Xenophon and Demosthenes:

Xenophon *Hell.* iv 8, 6 τὸν δὲ Κόνων εκέλευεν εὐτρεπίζεσθαι τὰς καθ' Ἑλλήσ-ποντον πόλεις, ὅπως εἰς τὸ ἔαρ ὅτι πλεύ-στον ναυτικὸν ἀθροισθείη.

ib. iv 8, 12 οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἀκού-οντες ὅτι Κόνων . . . τὰς τε νῆσους καὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ παρὰ θάλατταν πόλεις Ἀθηναῖος εὐτρεπίζουν, . . .

Demosthenes *De Corona* § 175 ἐκείνος δύσους ἡ πείσαι χρήμασιν Θηβαίον ἡ ἔξαπατήσαις ἐνήν ἀπαντας ηὐτρέπισται.

In all these passages the verb seems to mean something like 'win over',

'ensure the support of', and if this meaning can be given to *εὐτρεπής ποιοῦ* in *H.F.* 497, we get the excellent sense 'Do you, woman, seek to gain the support of the powers below, but I appeal to Zeus.'

I should add that, after writing this note, I discovered that Professor H. O. Meredith of Queen's University, Belfast, in his *Four Dramas of Euripides: Hecuba, Heracles, Andromache, Orestes* (1937), had anticipated my view of the general sense of 497, which he translates

Seek thou thy favours, daughter, from the deeps.

Professor Meredith tells me that he was influenced partly by the same arguments as those which I have used in this paper, and partly by the observation that 'such preparations for the funeral as are open to Megara have in fact already been made!' This last point seems to me sound and important. Professor Meredith had not anticipated my explanation of *εὐτρεπής ποιοῦ*.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

#### PERSEPHONE AND THE POMEGRANATE (H. DEM. 372-4).

To ensure Persephone's annual return to himself, Hades

βοῆς κόκκον ἐδωκε φαγεῖν μελιδέα λάθρη  
ἀσφι ἐ νομήσας, ἵνα μὴ μένη ἡμέτα πάντα  
αὐτοῖς παρ' αἰδοῖς Δημήτερι κνανοπέπλῳ.

Sikes notes Santen's emendation *ἀμφὶς* for *ἀμφὶ ἐ*, followed at one time by Hermann, and also Ruhnken's *ἀμφὶ ἐ*, which Hermann accepted later; as if Hades shared the pomegranate seed with Persephone. But no one who has tried to share a pomegranate or its seed with someone, openly or *λάθρη*, will follow Hermann. What we have to do is to elucidate the manuscript.

With Hermes standing by, and Persephone already arisen (371) from the bed (343) where her lord was sitting (*ἥμενον*) beside her, it was not easy for Hades to feed Persephone with pomegranate *λάθρη*. Let him who doubts repeat the performance, using moreover the violence of which Persephone afterwards complained (*ἄκουσαν δὲ βίη με προσηνάγκασσε πάσασθαι*, 413).

Rhythm and parallel passage (411) notwithstanding — and Sikes admits that *λάθρη* in 411 may mean 'perhaps "treacherously"', i.e. Persephone did not realize the result of eating — I submit that in 372 *λάθρη* should be construed with *ἀμφὶ ἐ νομήσας*. For what needs explanation here is (1) why Hermes did not see what Hades was doing, and (2) why the pomegranate brought Persephone back not merely to the Underworld, but from Demeter her mother to Hades himself as his *αἰδοῖη παράκοιτις* (343). Of the two 'dictionary' meanings of *νομήσας* — 'to distribute' or 'to manipulate' — the former, as we have seen, is precluded by the situation. Neither of these, however, is the primary meaning in any Homeric passage: *νομᾶν*, a frequentative cognate of *νέμειν*, is to put something to and fro repeatedly, — a sailor hauling and slackening a rope (*Od.* 10, 32), a warrior lunging and withdrawing his spear (*Il.* 5, 584), a runner plying his

knees (*Il.* 3. 218-9), a thinker 'this way and that dividing the swift mind' (*Od.* 13. 255, 18. 216); in which sense the word passes into later Greek.<sup>1</sup> In face of this testimony, it is difficult to see how ἀμφὶ ἐ νωμῆσας can mean anything but 'moving it to and fro about himself' or more colloquially 'rubbing it over him'.

What Hades did, then, was to put in effective contact with his person the pomegranate, whose general efficacy in respect of marriage and potency was common knowledge. Thereby he gave to it, literally, a personal application, making of it a love-charm to bind

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus IV. 128 describes the Scythians, harrying the forage-parties of Darius' army, as νωμῶντες ὅν στρα ἀναρρέοντος, a graphic phrase for hustling by repeated 'pushes' and withdrawals. Mr. J. Enoch Powell, however, *Lexicon to Herodotus* (1938) s.v., translates νωμῶντες as if it meant 'observe'.—J. L. M.

Persephone to himself; as the exchange of weapons between Odysseus and Iphitus was ἀρχὴ ξενοσύνης (*Od.* 21. 31-8). Such love-charms, instinct with the personality—the Polynesian *mana*—of the giver, are ubiquitous and immemorial.

The gesture, ἀμφὶ ἐ νωμῆσας, might well escape—and be intended to escape—the notice, not only of Hermes, but of Persephone herself. Indeed it is of this that she complains in 411, in reply to Demeter's question (404) καὶ τίνι σ' ἔξαπάτησε δόλῳ; for it was no δόλος to make a person eat pomegranate βίη. Persephone knows, by now, that a spell is upon her; she 'feels like that'; her desire is to her husband; and it must have been that pomegranate. Of course she says now that he *made* her eat it; but of that there is nothing in 371-4.

JOHN L. MYRES.

New College, Oxford.

#### CATO'S CHARM FOR DISLOCATIONS.

LUXUM siquod est, hac cantione sanum fiet. Harundinem prende tibi viridem P. IIII aut quinque longam, medianam diffinde, et duo homines teneant ad coxendices. Incipe cantare: 'motas uaeta daries dardares astataries dissunapiter', usque dum coeant. Ferrum insuper iactato. Ubi coierint et altera alteram tetigerint, id manu prehende et dextera sinistra praecide, ad luxum aut ad fracturam alliga, sanum fiet.—*De Agri Cultura* CLX.

This infallible cure for dislocations is famous, but the language of the chapter is economical and obscure. Of the translations to which I have access none succeeds in presenting an intelligible picture of what actually took place.<sup>1</sup> The difficulties begin with the words 'medianam diffinde, et duo homines teneant ad coxendices'—'Coupez-le par le milieu, et que deux hommes le tiennent sur vos cuisses' (Nisard: *Les Agronomes latins*); 'Split

it down the middle, and let two men hold it to your hips' (Hooper: Loeb translation); 'Spaccala in mezzo, e due persone la tengano appoggiata alla coscia' (Curcio: *La primitiva civiltà latina agricola*). Nisard's translation assumes both 'le' and 'vos'. 'Le' is misleading and inconsistent with the rendering of 'ubi coierint' below ('lorsque les deux parties seront réunies'); as for 'vos', we have no justification for supposing that the performer of the ceremony is also the patient; indeed the probabilities are plainly against such a view. Curcio repeats the first mistake, and the Loeb translation both, with the additional one of 'Split it down the middle', which makes chaos of the succeeding operations. Surely when Cato says 'medianam' without qualification, the natural sense is the middle of the length, not of the cross-section.

'Ferrum insuper iactato'—'Keep brandishing a sword over them' (Bréhaut: *Cato the Censor on Farming*); 'Brandish a knife over them' (Loeb); 'Ponvi sopra un ferro' (Curcio). 'Poni' scarcely seems adequate for 'iactato'. 'Sword' and 'knife' neglect

<sup>1</sup> To the translations here mentioned add Lowe: *Magic in Greek and Roman Literature*, p. 16; and Cyril Bailey: *Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome*, p. 13. Both these accounts are, I believe, fundamentally mistaken.

the magical property of iron.<sup>1</sup> (Bréhaut recognizes this important fact in a footnote: but why not translate 'iron'?)

'Id manu prehende et dextera sinistra praecide'—'saisissez-les et coupez-les en tous sens' (Nisard); 'seize them in the hand and cut them off to right and left' (Bréhaut); 'grasp with the hand and cut right and left' (Loeb). All these renderings fail to grasp the significance of 'id', and therefore, as I shall presently attempt to show, miss the most important feature of the ceremony. In the Loeb 'praecide' is not given its proper force. Nisard's 'coupez-les en tous sens', whatever it may mean, is certainly no translation of Cato's words. When Cato said 'dextera sinistra', he meant exactly what he said.

It must be remembered that, even if Cato's economy of language makes his account difficult for the modern reader, there was no such obscurity in his own eminently practical mind. He is giving a matter-of-fact description of a familiar operation, and if he omits details which to us are all-important, it is because they are perfectly obvious to him. But even a slight acquaintance with the principles of sympathetic magic enables us to reconstruct the scene with some confidence, in a way which does no violence to Cato's language.

The purpose is to knit together a broken bone, or two bones which have become dislocated. Consequently sympathetic magic demands that an object bearing some resemblance to human bone be broken in a similar way and rejoined. A reed if it is divided in the middle can be said to represent a fractured or dislocated bone; if split down the middle it could have no symbolical resemblance, and on this supposition no intelligible meaning can be given to the words 'id manu prehende et dextera sinistra praecide'. I do not believe that there is any overwhelming evidence against taking 'diffinde' of latitudinal severance. Is it possible that 'diffinde' means that the reed is to be broken or torn apart, not cut, in order that its

magical virtue may not be prejudiced by the contact of iron or other metal?<sup>2</sup> A green reed is chosen probably from the necessity of using an object in which there is life.

Three actors are needed in the ceremony, two to bring the halves together (symbolizing the knitting-together of the bone), and the third to direct the performance, and to pronounce the magic formula. This third person will naturally be the 'paterfamilias', to whom the whole book is addressed. Another important function of the two assistants is to provide human contact which will help to give the reed its magic efficacy. But why 'ad coxendices'? Probably because the hip provides an important joint near the surface with which the reed can be brought into close contact, without hindering the free use of the legs. The assistants, then, hold their halves the one to his left hip, the other to his right, in such a way that the severed or broken ends project horizontally. The men now begin to move sideways towards each other, so that the ends come together. During this operation the master of ceremonies recites the appropriate formula and, to keep the magic from leaking out and any hostile *mana* from getting in,<sup>2</sup> makes passes over the two halves with an iron object (probably a knife, but not necessarily). When the free ends have met, he grasps the joint ('id' must surely refer loosely to the preceding clause 'ubi . . . tegerint'). In order to do so he must be facing the horizontal reed, at the point where the ends have met, with his assistants to right and left of him. This fact makes clear what happens next. The magic is concentrated in the joint, so he cuts the reed short ('praecide') on the right and left (i.e. on each side of the joint), according to the length of splint required. The rest of the reed is not needed. Perhaps this 'cutting short' had a magical, as well as a merely utilitarian value, the knife driving the sensitive magic towards the joint itself and, as it were, sealing the ends of the ligature.<sup>2</sup> The section

<sup>1</sup> For magic iron cf. Pliny *N.H.* XXIV 9. 41, 10. 111, XXVIII 6. 17, XXXIV 15. 44; and *C.Q.* XXI, p. 122 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For these interesting suggestions and for helpful criticism I am indebted to Professor H. J. Rose.

containing the magic joint is now bound upon the patient, who only becomes relevant when the splint has been prepared.

The only assumption which has to be made in the above reconstruction is the movement of the two assistants towards each other. Cato leaves it to be understood from the presence of

'duo homines'. He would never expect his reader to imagine the two halves mysteriously coming together of their own accord. This part of the magic, like all the rest, had to be worked by human agency.

ERIC LAUGHTON.

*University of Sheffield.*

VIRGIL, ECL. IV, 23.

At tibi prima, puer, nullo munuscula cultu errantis hederas passim cum baccare tellus mixtaque ridenti colocasia fundet acantho. <sup>20</sup>  
ipsae lacte domum referent distenta capellae ubera, nec magnos metuent armenta leones. ipsa tibi blandos fundent cunabula flores. <sup>23</sup>  
occidet et serpens, et fallax herba ueneni occidet; Assyrium uulgo nascetur amomum. <sup>25</sup>

WHY is the infant's cradle mentioned precisely at this place, between the lions, reformed characters though they be, and the snake, perish though he must? In default of a satisfactory answer to this question,<sup>1</sup> I suggest that in Virgil's autograph line 23 came immediately after line 20 and should be separated from it only by a light punctuation after *acantho*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Editors of Virgil do not even raise the question, though Ladewig-Deuticke (1915) on line 24 seems to have qualms ('Zusammenhang: unter den Blumen steckt keine Giftschlange'). There is nothing helpful in the comment of F. Marx (*Neue Jahrb.*, 1, 1898, p. 114): 'Wir müssen uns mit der Erkenntnis der Entstehung dieser Inkonsistenz und mit der Überlieferung, so wie sie ist, beschließen'; nor in that of S. Sudhaus (*Rh. Mus.*, 56, 1901, p. 47): 'Steht Vers 23 zwischen 21-25, die die Befriedung der Natur malen, so sehr an seiner Stelle'; and still less in the tentative suggestion of J. Kroll (*Herm.*, 57, 1922, p. 610) that 'eine Klitterung vorliegt, bei der der Dichter keinen ebenmässigen Gedankenfluss hat erzielen können'.

<sup>2</sup> This transposition occurred to me independently; but I find that W. Klouček suggested it, in a Leitmeritz Program, as long ago as 1873. I have not been able to trace a copy of this pamphlet in England or secure one abroad, and therefore do not know Klouček's arguments. When Fritzsche refers to the pamphlet (*Bursian*, 1, 1873, p. 311) he mentions only the resulting anaphora (*ipsa, ipsae*). In his edition of the Eclogues (1888), Klouček keeps the traditional order in his text and in his notes on line 23 simply says: 'haud scio an post v. 20 transponendus sit'. An identical transposition, however, is unconsciously made by E. Norden (*Die Geburt des Kindes*, p. 9) in his brief summary: 'Erdreich selbst wird lachende Blumen,

It has not been clearly realized, I think, that progress towards the golden age is to be manifested in two ways.<sup>3</sup> On the one hand, there will be a continuance and extension of nature's present beneficence; the earth will be lavish with the pleasant, simple, harmless things which already flourish without human toil. On the other hand, there will be an amelioration of nature; the goats, so far from wandering, will need no herdsman to drive them home, lions will lose their ferocity, snakes and poisonous plants will thrive no more. Obviously it is to the first, and not to the second class of benefits that the cradle belongs.

But the suggested transposition does more than eject an intruder and avoid a very awkward sequence of ideas. It has the positive advantage of bringing together things which are in harmony and ought to be together.<sup>4</sup> It also provides a suitable climax (to which the repetition *fundet, fundent* contributes) for the first half of the passage: not only will the earth be lavish, but the

kleine Geschenke für dich, ausstreuen, deine Wiege sich in einen Wundersegan von Blüten kleiden. Auch die Tiere. . . . and by E. K. Rand (*The Magical Art of Virgil*): 'She lavishes her flowers without tillage; they spring up about the cradle of the child. Goats come. . . . See also Conington's summary of 18-25.

<sup>3</sup> Conington's note on line 18 contains a bare hint of this.

<sup>4</sup> It may be said that *amomum* in line 25 vitiates the argument. But (a) *nasceret amomum* is simply a counterpart to *fallax herba ueneni occidet*; (b) *amomum* is a word of good omen with which to end the whole passage; (c) the argument does not depend upon a mechanical grouping of flowers on one side and animals on the other (as Cartault, *Étude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile*, 1897, p. 241, seems to think Klouček intended).

very cradle too.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore it reveals an attractive balance in the structure of the passage: we have four lines devoted to the pretty things for the child himself, and four lines which hint at benefits not confined to the child.<sup>2</sup> Finally, it brings out the metrical antitheses: the first four lines run smoothly into one another, whereas the second group consists of two couplets, each of which has a heavy break after the first foot of its second line.

The origin of the error requires no elaborate explanation. The juxtaposition of two lines beginning *ipsa*, *ipsae* led to the omission of line 23; either the slip was noticed immediately and the line inserted as soon as possible, or the line was added at the foot of the page and then restored in the wrong place. The false order would be the more likely to persist in a passage where the mention of marvels would put even the critical reader off his guard.

J. F. MOUNTFORD.

*University of Liverpool.*

at tibi prima, puer, nullo munuscula cultu errantis hederas passim cum baccare tellus mixtaque ridenti colocasia fundet acantho; 20 ipsa tibi blandos fundet cunabula flores. 23 ipsae lacte domum referant distinta capellae 21 ubera, nec magnos metuent armenta leones; occidet et serpens, et fallax herba ueneni 24 occidet; Assyrium ulgo nascetur amomum.

Invited by my colleague to guess without further prompting what transposi-

tion he required within 18-25, I read the familiar lines with an awakened intelligence for the first time in my life. In my reply I further credited him with a consequential alteration as printed above. He welcomed this amendment, and I would gladly have left its exposition in his hands; but as luck will have it, the major emendation has been (if barely) anticipated, while this its corollary is (he assures me) an entirely novel proposal; and he insists that I should introduce it myself.

The secondary change, small as it is, materially alters both the construction and the sense of the transposed line. In doing so it detracts nothing from the claims of the transposition, upon which it is demonstrably itself entirely dependent; on the contrary it recommends the transposition by conferring upon it several additional advantages, which as I see them are as follows:

First, it presents *cunabula* as the explanation of *prima munuscula*; for otherwise one must naturally wonder what the baby is to do with so many flowers—including *wandering ivy*; they can hardly be desirable as toys. A cradle, and then milk, these are his primary requirements; not flowers and milk; not even 'toys and milk' (Contington). A cradle, and then milk—these are, we may now see, the first voluntary tributes of adoring Nature.

Next—a comparatively small advantage, but a pendant to the above—this fourth line in summarizing the preceding three now presents 'tibi . . . cunabula' as exactly balancing 'tibi . . . munuscula', thus eliciting a clear point from the apparently calculated correspondence of these pairs of words in position relative to the line.

Thirdly, this adjustment removes the obscurity of expression in the line itself. For the strange and almost grotesque conception of a florescent—not an embroidered, but a *self-efflorescent*—cradle, a conception surely otherwise unexampled,<sup>3</sup> it substitutes through a simple metaphor a picture alike natural and poetical, and one to which a parallel is readily forthcoming. An earlier *Wunderkind*, the *Iamus* of Pindar's sixth

<sup>1</sup> Commentators do not help us to understand the precise relation between the *cunabula* and the *flores*. In his translation (*Virgil's Messianic Eclogue*, p. 5) R. S. Conway speaks of 'thy cradle blossoming for joy'; but later (p. 40) of 'the magical flowers beside the cradle'. Contington in his note says: 'The ground on which thou liest will of its own accord bring forth flowers'. No parallel is cited from ancient literature for a sprouting cradle.

<sup>2</sup> A poet of Virgil's quality expounds a general theme by particulars which have a special propriety. So the items of the second group are not selected without regard to the child. As Servius naively remarks, milk is good for babies: its bounteous supply (cf. *distenta*) is secured by the willing co-operation of the sheep-goats and the immunity of the cattle from attacks by lions; the snake is an evil which the child is not yet old enough to avoid for himself, and the poison-plant he cannot yet distinguish from the flowers amidst which it might be growing.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Professor Mountford's n. 1 on this page.

*Olympian*, was likewise cradled in flowers.<sup>1</sup>

Again, while 'fundet, fundent' was good rhetoric, '*nullo cultu tibi prima munuscula fundet colocasia etc., ipsa tibi cunabula fundet flores*' is still better.

But the consideration which (I think) mainly prompted the change, and which I feel to be inescapable,<sup>2</sup> is that the earth cannot be described as 'ipsa cunabula' to a high-born babe (line 17), who, although he will doubtless be put out of doors to sleep by day like any other of us, will have in his nursery a handsome cradle of his own. And another argument surely equally decisive is that if *ipsa cunabula* means the ground there is nothing to wonder at; what should Earth do but send forth flowers? In point of fact, *ipsa cunabula* nominative to *fundent flores* is two contrary faults in combination; as the equivalent of *tellus* a truism, as *cunabula* a monstrosity. What is marvellous is that *Tellus* should concern herself

<sup>1</sup> The verdure of Hor. *carm.* III iv 9-20 is camouflage, not a coverlet.

<sup>2</sup> It could only be escaped by understanding 'that *very-part-of-the-earth* which constitutes your (temporary) cradle'; and if there is anybody who really wants to do that, it would probably be wisest to humour him.

to provide a cradle for a particular child.

I regard<sup>3</sup> the passage as composed of two quatrains; though it seems to me almost immaterial whether one follows *leones* with a semicolon or a full stop. What I take (after due reflection) to be indisputable is the full stop after *flores*. *Ipsa* is not balanced by *ipsae*; it is itself the counterpoise to the preceding *nullo cultu*. *Ipsae* is of course anaphoric to *ipsa*, it could not be otherwise; but the anaphora is resumptive; *ipsa* is the echo by which the first line of the second quatrain is associated with the last line of the first.

As to the cause of this corruption, it should be observed that that points in the same direction as everything else. Once the line had got misplaced, *ipsa* had nothing to refer to, and could only be taken with *cunabula*. And finally it is just possibly worth remarking that the homoearchon *ipsa . . . ipsae* was the more insidious as each of these words was at a nearly similar angle to a preceding *fundet*.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

*University of Liverpool.*

<sup>3</sup> In agreement, I am glad to find, with M. see above.

### JUVENAL V. 108-6.

vos anguilla manet longae cognata colubrae,  
aut glacie aspersus maculis Tiberinus et ipse  
vernula riparum, pinguis torrente cloaca  
et solitus mediae cryptam penetrare Suburae.

JUVENAL is here commenting on the inferior fish served to the cliens, while the rich man gets a mullet from Corsica or a muraena from Sicily. The second line does not make sense. It is difficult to understand the point of *glacie*, for, as Housman ironically suggests, sewers are not remarkably cold places, nor is it easy to understand why ice should cause spots on fish. It might be added that the juxtaposition of an ablative of cause and an ablative of instrument in one phrase makes clumsy syntax. *Tiberinus* is no less of a problem. It is commonly taken to mean *lupus Tiberinus*, but this is impossible for a number of reasons. In the first place *lupus* will

not fit into the sense of the passage because it is a luxury fish (cf. Martial II 37, 4; IX 26, 6; etc.), those caught in the river being especially prized (Pliny *N.H.* IX (54) 168 ff.; (28) 61; Macrobius *Sat.* III 16), whereas rhetorical effect demands after the eel a second repulsive fish to contrast with the mullet and the muraena.

It is further doubtful whether *Tiberinus* was ever used substantively in Latin as the name of a fish. It is true that Bücheler (*Rh. M.* 35, 392 ff.) seems to have found some support for this usage in Galen *de alim. fac.* (Kühn VI 722): ὁσπέρ γε καὶ οἱ κατὰ τὸν ποταμὸν αὐτὸν γεννώμενοι ἵχθνες· καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔνιοι Τιβερίνους . . . But I am inclined to question the independence of this witness, for it should be noted that Galen does not himself know

the name of the fish, so that his information would seem to be derived from reading or hearsay, and *the name must be derived from a Latin source*. Nor can it be merely a coincidence that the only two passages in literature where the *Tiberinus* is mentioned should both be concerned with the effects of sewage on fish (cf. Juv. 105). It seems, therefore, probable that Galen had the passage of Juvenal in mind when he wrote the words *καλοῦσι δ' αὐτοὺς ἔμοι . . .* There is, however, in Latin a passage (*Hist. Aug. XVII* 17, 5 f.) in which Heraeus (*A.L.L. XII*, 1902, p. 278) finds a mention of the *Tiberinus*. This passage deals with the horrible end of Heliogabalus, who was *tractus* (*sc. unco*) *et in cloacam missus et in Tiberim praecepitatus*. For this he received the nick-names of *Tractaticius* and *Impurus* and *Tiberinus*. Heraeus comments: 'so sei es bemerkt dass der Witz erst in seiner Pointe verstanden wird, wenn man sich erinnert, dass Tiberinus der Eigenname eines Lupus-Fisches ist, der in den Kloaken des Tiber sich mästete.'<sup>1</sup> This is far from convincing. *Tiberinus* has no more point than the other epithets. H. was called *Tractaticius* because he was *tractus*, *Impurus* because he was *in cloacam missus*, and *Tiberinus* because he was *in Tiberim praecepitatus*. Consequently it is difficult to see how this passage could be held to constitute evidence for the existence of *Tiberinus* as a fish name.<sup>2</sup>

We are faced, then, with a double difficulty—a corrupt *glacie* and a missing noun required to support *Tiberinus*. It is tempting to conclude that this noun lies concealed in *glacie*. The possibilities can be narrowly circumscribed: we have to find a fresh-water fish which is likely to frequent sewers and whose name resembles *glacie*, into which it has been corrupted. The scavenger fish are to be found among the carp or the siluroid families. The carp would be rhetorically unsatisfactory as it was esteemed as a food, nor is there any Latin name for it which

resembles *glacie*; but among the siluroids there is one fish which satisfies all the above conditions—the *glanis*. It is mentioned in three passages of Pliny (*N.H. IX*, 145; *XXXII*, 128 and 148), and its habits are carefully described by Aristotle in a number of passages (*Hist. An.* 490a, 505a, 506b, 568b, 602b, 608a, 621a). This fish has been identified as a member of the cat-fish family or siluroids (D'Arcy Thompson in *Companion to Greek Studies*, p. 48). The Danube species of this family, the Wels, I have myself seen caught in the mud of that river. It is mud-coloured, with dark patches on its skin, and it is provided with the long gill-rakers that resemble whiskers and give the family its popular English name. On the cat-fish the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th ed. V, 30) has the following note: 'nearly all the siluroids are fresh-water fish . . . most are omnivorous, feeding on almost any kind of animal or vegetable matter and *acting as scavengers*.' We may, therefore, remove the material and syntactical difficulties of the passage merely by altering two letters and reading *glanis* for *glacie*. This word by its unfamiliarity would have been exposed to scribal corruption, and the habits of the fish as above described fit well into the sense of the passage.

L. R. PALMER.

*University of Manchester.*

#### ADDENDUM.

This article was already in proof when the *Philol. Wochenschrift* 1938, nr. 2, 55 made me aware of H. J. Rose's discussion of the passage in *Harvard Studies* 1936, 11. Professor Rose announces that he had thought of *glanis* but rejected it after consultation with Professor D'Arcy Thompson. It is worth recording that we have arrived at the same goal by different roads. Professor Rose bases his suggestion on the scholiast's note *nomen piscis*, whereas my case rests on the impossibility of *Tiberinus* as a substantive. I had overlooked the scholiast's note (as Professor Rose remarks, its position is uncertain), but it is a welcome corroboration of my argument; conversely my argument will perhaps remove doubts about the

<sup>1</sup> The *lupus* was exclusively carnivorous (Arist. *Hist. An.* VIII 591a).

<sup>2</sup> The point of *Tiberinus* probably consists in a playful reference to Tiberius. See further Dio LXXX, 1.

position and reference of the gloss. Professor Thompson, however, is reported as having said that the *glanis* is not Italian and does not come up estuaries. The second point would be fatal if it were true. But I, too, had naturally consulted the works of the acknowledged authority in this field. Professor Thompson places the *glanis* among the siluroids, a family which embraces more than a thousand species spread over the fresh waters of all parts of the world (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., V, 513). Authorities are agreed that the *glanis* of Aristotle and Pliny is allied to the Wels, which zoologists designate *silurus glanis*. Pausanias 4, 34, 2 mentions it as a river fish, and in his translation of the *Historia Animalium* Professor Thompson consistently renders *glanis* as 'sheat-fish', a word on which the *O.E.D.* gives 'a large fresh-water fish, *Silurus glanis*'. So it is clear that Professor Thompson himself is fully aware of the habitat of *glanis* and that the objection reported by his colleague was merely a *lapsus linguae* which arose in conversation. Perhaps Professor Rose will now restore his emendation to his favour. We agree that *glacie* must be a corruption of the name of a fish; its name must resemble *glacie*, and it must be a fresh-water fish with scavenging habits. This disposes of *glaucus* and *gladius*, which 'friendly critics' have suggested to Professor

Rose. On *glaucus* Aristotle remarks (*H.A.* 598a) 'the following are deep-sea fishes . . . and the *glaucus*'. As for the sword-fish, is it possible that a predatory sea-fish would be found in a sewer? It is in fact 'abundant off the Sicilian coasts and on the opposite coast of Calabria' (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., XXVI, 275). This leaves us with *glanis*, which, as we saw, is not only a fresh-water fish but belongs to a family whose habits suit the required sense admirably. As for the assertion that the fish is not attested for Italy, this at best would be an *argumentum ex silentio*, and our knowledge of the zoological world of the ancients is far from complete; nor should we overlook the fact that the scholiast's note suggests that we must look for a word of rare occurrence. The *glanis* may well have existed in Italian waters in ancient times. The species is, of course, extinct today both in Greece and in Italy: but it is interesting to note that the related American cat-fish flourishes today in Italian waters (*Encyclopaedia Italiana* XXXI, 785). I venture to hope that scholars will receive favourably as a solution of this crux an emendation in which I gladly acknowledge Professor Rose's priority.

Professor Rose now writes to me that he is in complete agreement with my note and that he thinks his emendation 'pretty well confirmed'.

L. R. P.

#### SCALIGER ON HERODOTUS.

THE Cambridge University Library possesses a copy of the vulgate of Herodotus (Stephanus: Geneva 1570) from Bishop Moore's library (Nn—V—26), which is inscribed on the title-page: *Olim Josephi Scaligeri, nunc Danielis Heinsii ex legato eius*, and contains notes and emendations by Scaliger. They include a score of conjectures which in our texts or apparatuses stand to the credit of later scholars: 1, 181, 2 *μέρ* for *ην* (Gronovius); 2, 32, 4 *ὑ τελευτή < τό >* *τῆς Λιβύης* (Reiske); 40, 2 *κενήν* for *κείην* (Schweighäuser); 102, 4 *[περ]* (Valkenaer); 141, 5 *ἀπικούμενοι* for *ἀπικούέντος* (Schaefer); 142, 4 *ἴξω* for *ἴξ* (van Herwerden); 3, 22, 2 *τὸν χρύσεον . . . στρεπτόν* for *χρυσόν* (Schaefer); 74, 1 *[τὸν Πηρείασπεα]* (van Herwerden); 91, 3 *μυρίδας* for *μυράδας* (Reiske); 4, 6, 1 *βασιλίδιον* for *βασιλέας* (Wesseling); 11, 3 *καταλαμβάνειν* for *καταλαμβάνειν* (Reiske); 33, 4 *τοῖς πλησιοχώροις* for *τοῖς πλησιοχώρους* (Wesseling); 72, 5 *κύκλῳ*

*< περι > τὸ σῆμα* (Reiske); 97, 1 *[Δαρεῖος]* (Mehler); 172, 3 *τοῖς τοῖς* for *τοῖς τοῖς* (Hude); 5, 28 *ἀνεύς* for *ἀνεύς* (de la Barre); 6, 84, 2 *[κελεύειν]* (Cobet); 7, 170, 3 *οἰκτοι* for *οἰκήτοι* (Schaefer); 194, 3 *< περι > ἐσεσθαι* (Reiske); 8, 106, 2 *ἐκεῖν* for *ἐκείνη* (van Herwerden); 9, 120, 4 *σαΐδης* for *σαΐδας* (Reiske). A few other suggestions deserve mention: 2, 65, 2 *ἀνεῖται < ταῦ > ταὶ λρά*, where Valkenaer deleted *ταῦ* and Stein proposed *< θηρα > λρά*; 121e4 *ἀνοικάτορος μὲν ἐργασμένος δέ τε τοῦ ἀδελφεοῦ ἀποτάμω τὴν κεφαλήν, σοφότατος δὲ δέ τε (for δτι) καταλύει τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τὸν νέκυν*, where Madvig altered *δέ το δτι*; 4, 3, 3 *ἐκείνους κτείναντες* (for *κτείνοντες*) *ἐλασσόνυν τὸ λοιπὸν ἀρκομεν*; 64, 2 *ἐκ δὲ χαλινῶν τοι ἵππου τὸν αὐτὸν ἐλαύνει, ἐκ τοῖς τοῖς (for τοῖς τοῖς) ἔπαπτε καὶ δύδλατες*; 87, 1 *ἐνταῦθα γράμματα . . . < λέγοντα > θεοῖς πάντα διατερηθεῖς*; 8, 2, 1 *ἐπόσας* for *ἐπ* *τὸ πλήθος* (θεον πλήθος Reiske).

The remaining Herodotean adversaria in the Cambridge library are of little interest. Those of Porson and Dobree have long been public

marks  
o-sea  
s for  
at a  
in a  
posite  
Bri-  
This  
saw,  
ongs  
the  
the  
ested  
an  
now-  
the  
nor  
the  
munt  
The  
lian  
cies  
in  
rest-  
ican  
lian  
XI,  
dars  
on  
eadly  
ty.  
me  
with  
da-  
-.

marks  
o-sea  
s for  
at a  
in a  
posite  
Bri-  
This  
saw,  
ongs  
the  
the  
ested  
an  
now-  
the  
nor  
the  
munt  
The  
lian  
cies  
in  
rest-  
ican  
lian  
XI,  
dars  
on  
eadly  
ty.  
me  
with  
da-  
-.

property. Hermann's (Oo—I—59) contain nothing worth mention except 3, 74; 2 *τάκτα* for *τὰ πάντα*; 4, 48, 1 lacuna before *ποταμούς καὶ* *ἄλλων*; and 119, 4 *πενισθεῖα* for *οὐ πενισθεῖα* (ol. ēr. Stein). Markland (Nn—II—23) anticipated Eldick's *θολερῷ* for *θολερῷ* 6, 35, 2, and Casaubon (Nn—VI—29) Dobree's *θλαστόν* for *θλαχόν* 1, 167, 1 and (like Scaliger) Schaefer's *οἰλσταί* for *οἰκήσταί* 7, 170, 3; he also proposed *εἰτόν* for *εἰχόν* 6, 42, 2 (referring to 3, 90, 1) and the transference of *τοῦθε εἰνεκά* 6, 53, 2 after *θλαστόν*.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

University of Sydney.

#### DIRECTION-POSTS AND THE DATE OF DEMETRIUS DE ELOCUTIONE.

IN C.R. L (1936) pp. 166 f. Dr. Cary suggested the existence of direction-posts on Roman roads, at least from the time of the consulship of P. Popilius (132 B.C.). There is a clear and unmistakable reference to direction-posts in Demetrius, *de Eloc.* 202, where the form of sentence-periods is being discussed: *περάσθαι δὲ μὴ εἰς μῆκος ἔκτεινε τὰς περιγραφάς· ὅ γάρ Αἰγαῖος δένον ἐπὶ Πίλινδον δρόν ἀναθετεῖ μέν παρὰ Στράτον πόλιν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν διέξειν· ἀλλὰ αὐτόθιν ἀπολήγειν καὶ ἀναταίνειν τὸν ἀκόνοντα οὐτος· ὅ γάρ Αἰγαῖος δένον μὲν ἐπὶ Πίλινδον δρόν, ἔξειν δὲ εἰς θάλασσαν· πολὺ γάρ οὐτος σαφέστερος, ὥσπερ δια τοῦτο σημεῖον ἔχοντα δύο καὶ πολλὰς ἀναταύλας· ηγεμός γάρ τὰ σημεῖα έκεκεν, η δὲ ἀσημειωτος<sup>1</sup> καὶ μονοειδής, καὶ μικρά γάρ ἀδηλος δοκεῖ.*

If direction-posts in the Mediterranean area were a Roman invention or institution (and there is no mention of them earlier in that region), if the beginning of their use dated from about the time of Popilius, and if we may follow the suggestion implicit in Demetrius of an already established system of such signs, we can safely assume that the treatise of Demetrius was not written before 100 B.C. at the very earliest.<sup>2</sup>

J. F. LOCKWOOD.

University College, London.

#### OAXES. VIRGIL ECL. 1. 66.

IN C.R. LI. p. 213, Mr. W. F. J. Knight says that 'there was a city Oxus in Crete, but it is

<sup>1</sup> L.S.<sup>9</sup> renders *ἀσημειωτος* 'without signposts', but *s.v.* *σημεῖον* makes no reference to the Demetrian sense, though the meaning 'milestone' is cited from Plutarch and Herodian (cf. also *σημεῖον ad init.*).

<sup>2</sup> The reference in § 108 to *γείσος . . . καὶ τριγλύφοις καὶ πορφύραις πλατείαις* may then be specifically Roman. L.S.<sup>9</sup> cites *πορφύρα πλατεία* from Polyb. X 26, 1, but wrongly.

never spelt *Oaxus*'; and adds that 'it is thought to be the Axos of Hdt. IV. 154'. He has overlooked Steph. Byz. *Οαξός Οάξος* (with the variant *Πλάξ*, *Skylax Periplus* 47); the adjective *γαῖς Οαξίδος*, Apoll. Rhod. I. 1131; and the reading of the 'Roman' family of manuscripts 'Οαξός in Herodotus IV. 154. This reading is preferred to *Αξός* of the 'Florentines', RSV, by Stein and Hude; and represents the local spelling *ΦΑΞΙΟΝ* on coins until the time of Tiberius, and in inscriptions (Collitz *Gr. Dial. Inschr.* Nos. 5132, 5151, supplemented by *ΦΑΞΙΩΝ* in Collitz No. 5169 l. 14).

This is all without intent to obstruct Mr. Knight's 'Road to Oaxes' wherever and whatever Virgil may have meant *Oaxen* to be.

JOHN L. MYRES.

Oxford.

#### 'THE WHOLE TRUTH' IN ROMAN PROCEDURE.

SEN. *Contr. IO pr. I.* Seneca is tiring of the effort of reminiscence and asks his sons to let him off: if you like, he says, you can make me take an oath *dixisse me quae sci vi quaeque audivi quaeque ad hanc rem pertinere iudicavi*. The words (and especially *ad hanc rem*) read like an official formula humorously applied. That witnesses were regularly sworn is common knowledge (Cic. *Font.* 19, *Rosc. Com.* 44, *Sen. de Ira* 2. 29, Quint. 5. 7. 32, 9. 2. 98), but on the terms of their oath all the authorities are silent. Has Seneca preserved a scrap of procedure?

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

#### ORNATIO IN ASCONIUS, IN PISONIANAM 13.

IN my article 'Q. Mucius Scaevola the Pontifex and *Ornatio Provinciae*' in C.R. LI. (1937), 8 ff. I argued that the meaningless *oratio* in Asconius, *In Pisonianam* 13, should be emended to *ornatio*. It has since been pointed out to me by the editors of the C.R. that in making this suggestion I had been anticipated by J. S. Reid in his review of A. C. Clark's *Asconius* in C.R. XXIII. (1909), 21 ff. I have to apologize for my ignorance of this review, though I hope that the reading *ornatio* in this passage of Asconius—and, in this technical sense, here alone in extant Latin literature—may be thought to gain in attractiveness from the fact that it has twice been suggested independently.

J. P. V. D. BALSDON.

Exeter College, Oxford.

## REVIEWS

## ΑΙΔΩΣ.

Carl Eduard Frhr. von ERFFA: ΑΙΔΩΣ und verwandte Begriffe in ihrer Entwicklung von Homer bis Demokrit. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXX, Heft 2.) Pp. viii + 206. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1937. Paper, M. 10.50 (bound, 12).

THIS study is based on a dissertation for the Doctorate of Philosophy. The title gives a fair idea of its content. It is primarily a discussion of the history of the conception *aiðōs* in Greek literature down to the end of the fifth century. Such a discussion naturally involves the consideration of other conceptions which are found connected with *aiðōs* at various periods. The conceptions specially treated here are *νέμεσις*, *δῆμος*, *σέβας*, *ἄλεος*, *ἄξεσθαι*, and *τὸ αἰσχρόν*, with the derivative words. In a short introduction the author justifies his treatment of a subject already handled, on the ground that the 'erneuerte Humanismus' of to-day provides new tasks for 'Wort- und Begriffs-forschung', and he acknowledges a debt to B. Snell's *Aischylos und das Handeln in Drama* and to Jost Trier's *Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes* for indication of the method to be adopted. Trier advocates the study of successive cross-sections of the whole 'Sprachfeld'; von Erffa emphasizes the greater need for keeping clear the lines of thought connecting the successive cross-sections (in practice, he tends to interpret this excellent principle too narrowly; he usually refers back from an author to his predecessors, but he seldom refers forward, which seems to me at least as important to the reader). The material is treated in ten chapters: Homer; Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns, with an appendix on 'Der

Begriff Νέμεσις und die Gottheiten Nemesis und Aidos'; the Lyric Poets; Aeschylus, with an appendix on 'αιδεῖσθαι im attischen Recht' (mainly on the *λιθος ἀναιδείας*); Sophocles; Euripides, with an appendix on the Tragic fragments; Aristophanes, with an appendix on the Comic fragments; Herodotus; Thucydides; and the Presocratics. Each chapter has its own summary, and there is a short final chapter in which the author gives his reasons for ending his study with Democritus, and briefly summarizes the conclusions to which he has come. There are indices of the passages most fully discussed and of key-words, both Greek and German, not mentioned in the Table of Contents.

In *The Rise of the Greek Epic* Professor Murray has said: 'A full understanding of the word *Aidos* would take one very far towards the understanding of all the hopes and creations of the Greek poets'. It may be that the evidence is insufficient for the 'full understanding' here postulated: at any rate, this extremely careful and accurate collection of the existing evidence falls far short of Professor Murray's ideal. Apart from suggesting that the article on *aiðōs* in the new Liddell-and-Scott needs recasting, it appears to add little to our knowledge of the deeper meaning of Greek literature. It is probably too much to expect of what is, after all, an apprentice work that it should do anything of the kind. The student who wishes to pursue the subject will find the facts which he needs in von Erffa's work, but he will have to provide the deeper thought himself.

J. A. DAVISON.

*University of Manchester.*

## THE ODYSSEY IN PLAIN PROSE.

*The Story of Odysseus*: a translation of Homer's 'Odyssey' into plain English. By W. H. D. Rouse. Pp. xv + 463. London: Nelson, 1937. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

How the verse-translators of Homer will envy Dr. Rouse his freedom to translate their bugbear *ω πότοι* in different contexts 'Upon my word!', 'What a shame!', 'Ah well!', 'Dear me!', 'Bless my soul!', and 'Damn it all!' (this last in the Earthshaker's mouth)! But they may well argue that, if Homer had sung in plain Greek, there would have been more reason to turn the *Odyssey* into plain English. However, while this plain English is often colloquial—'to go trapesing' (*ἀλάλησθαι*), 'the whole lot of come-marry-me-quicks' (*μνηστῆρας ἀγύρωρας*), 'we were fairly flummoxed' (*ἀγαστάμεθα*)—it does find room for rare and obsolete terms—'in the mischievous bodgery (*κακορραφίσσοι*) of their minds'—and oddities—'crumple-horn skew-the-dew (*εἰλίποδας*) cattle', and 'more of a shally-go-naked' (*κακίων*). In his Appendix, which touches on the *Iliad* also, Dr. Rouse briefly discusses (p. 433) the relation of Homer's words to the speech of the day; but the lack of any contemporary prose makes it impossible to reach a sure conclusion. He himself points out that ancient verses and archaic words are embedded in the poems, and he turns proverbial sayings in jingle form, e.g. 'Eternal lacrimation is a sorry occupation'.

*Notabilia* are the use of dialect by

Eurykleia, Eumaeus, and Philoetius; the explanatory translation of some proper names; and the illustrations from modern Greece. Omissions and expansions are frequent: for the latter, take 'the picture of health she was in her long frock' (p. 260), *ἰφθίμη* . . . *ταυνυπέπλῳ* (xv. 363). But xxii. 435 is wrongly translated (p. 377) as if the text had the nom. *Τηλέμαχος*, and there are a few misprints (e.g. p. 174 'Euryalos' *bis* for 'Eurylochos', p. 299 'Alcinoos' for 'Antinoos'; p. 347 'my' for 'may'; p. 446 *ἀπο-* for *ἀπαμει-βόμενος*).

This Homer in plain prose—therefore a *dimidiatus Homerus*, the third in succession to the versions of Butler and Lawrence—deserves welcome as a means of popularizing 'the best story ever written', and how skilfully Dr. Rouse brings out the details! One need not read far to find that the translator, like his hero, is *πολύμητις* and *πολύτροπος*: he is, in fact, *capable de tout*. As a translation of the *Odyssey*, the book gives one many jars, not all due to Homer's humour or caprice: as a running commentary (*pace* Dr. Rouse, who refers to 'even the commentators') aided by acute footnotes, it is most lively and illuminating, a book to read and enjoy—except perhaps for those who shrink from 'a plug of ambrosia'! A similar *Story of Ilios* (or *Ilion*, as Dr. Rouse has it) is clearly called for.

W. G. WADDELL.

*University of Egypt, Cairo.*

## THE ALEXANDROS OF EURIPIDES.

Bruno SNELL: *Euripides Alexandros und andere Strassburger Papyri mit Fragmenten griechischer Dichter*. Pp. vii + 111. (Hermes, Einzelschriften, Heft 5.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1937. Paper, RM. 9.60.

SINCE Cröner's edition of the fragments of the *Alexandros* there have appeared a brief account by the present reviewer (*New Chapters in Greek Literature*, Vol. III) and a dissertation by Lefke (Münster, 1936); but all previous work is superseded by the work now

before us, which is based on a new study of the papyrus, and a very full reconsideration of alternative possibilities in the reconstruction of the plot. The treatment includes a careful discussion of the relation of the play of Euripides to the *Alexander* of Ennius, the fable of Hyginus, and the Etruscan urns upon which the final scene is depicted; some few fragments of the poet which are not expressly ascribed to the play are also worked into it, most of them with great probability.

According to Snell's reconstruction, the prologue was spoken by Cassandra, who told of the exposure of the infant Alexander by Hecuba in consequence of a dream and an oracle. Then Hecuba enters with the Chorus and holds a brief conversation with Cassandra, who goes into the temple, while the Chorus comfort Hecuba for the loss of her son, who, unknown to her, has been brought up as a shepherd and has grown into a valiant youth. Cassandra returns and in a wild dialogue with Hecuba prophesies all the evil that is to come upon Troy, and Hecuba's own transformation into a hound. The placing of the Cassandra-fragments of Euripides and Ennius early in the play has in Snell's view the advantage that they serve as a prologue to the whole trilogy (*Alexandros, Palamedes, Troades*), which is bound together by her prophecies. After the first stasimon, Priam speaks of the games instituted in atonement for the exposure and goes away to preside at them. A servant announces the return of Alexander, who is determined to take part in the hope of winning back a favourite bull, which had been seized to serve as a prize, and describes the life and exploits of the young shepherd. The second stasimon over, a messenger describes the victory of Alexander over all competitors, including Deiphobus and Hector, who enter next, the former very angry at the victory of the supposed slave, while Hector takes it more quietly. They go to fetch Priam, and Alexander enters with a second chorus composed of shepherds; there is an *agon* of words in the presence of Priam between Deiphobus and Alexander, with opposing denunciations of slaves and of rich men. Priam favours Alexander, and after a double-chorus the shepherds

retire. Deiphobus and Hecuba, indignant at the defeat of her sons by a slave, conspire to murder Alexander, and attack him; he takes refuge at the altar. (The female with an axe on the Etruscan urns is identified by Snell with Hecuba, not with Cassandra.) Alexander is recognized just in time—it is not certain how, and the question is fully discussed (pp. 49-52)—and everything is cleared up by Aphrodite *ex machina*, who sends Alexander to Greece to find Helen, and presents all that is to follow as the will of Zeus.

Snell's reconstruction generally carries conviction, though in some minor points it is possible to differ from him (e.g. his reading ἐγὼ δὲ ἐνέπρω κείον on p. 44 seems very uncertain). He discusses the extent of Euripides' originality in the treatment of the story (in which he probably invented the participation of Hecuba in the attempted murder), and the light thrown by the play on the *Troades*. He does not accept Crönert's identification of the servant with the 'Archelaus' mentioned in another reference to the story.

The latter part of the volume discusses papyrus fragments of Euripides' *Phoenissae*, *Medea* and (?) *Μελανίπη Σοφή*, and of the *Hector* (?) of Astydamas, and a number of fragments, tragic, comic and lyric, mostly beyond intelligible restoration. In the difficult passage *Med.* 1087 ff. he would read (with some reason)

παῖρον δέ τι δή  
γένος ἐν πολλάς εἴροις ἀντίστοις  
οὐκ ἀπόμονον τὸ γυναικῶν.

But the papyrus as a whole contributes little of value to the textual criticism of the play.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

*University of Sheffield.*

#### THE TEUBNER

Demosthenes: *Orationes*. Post C. Fuhr edidit I. SYKUTRIS. Vol. II Pars I. Pp. 379. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1937. Export prices: paper, RM. 9.90; bound, 10.80.

VOLUME II of the Teubner Demosthenes carries on the retrogression to a

#### DEMOSTHENES.

saner text initiated by Fuhr. To take the first seven sections of XX, for example, Blass's readings are rejected in this as in the Oxford edition: 1 om. *περὶ αὐτοῦ* and *ἀνθρώπους* with Apsines and Hermogenes; 2 *ἔστιν* A; *ἀφέιλετο* ... *νομίζων* with F; 3 *δὰ γὰρ* with Aristides; 4 *ἔφ' ὅτι* with Apsines; 5 *ἴδητ'*;

προσήκε with F corr.; 6 om. καὶ before δι' ἔκεινο with S'; 7 τοὺς ἐπὶ with SY; om. μηδὲ with FAYP.

Fuhr's masterly preface might well have been reprinted. Instead we have a 'Praemonitum' on the editorial delays, which led the publisher to ask Dr. H. Sachsenweger 'ut redigeret hunc fasciculum in formam satis expolitam atque aptam ad imprimendum . . .'. The name of Sykutris is on the title-page, and the great bulk of the notes are styled 'Syk.'; a few in the first person—'velim', 'amovi'—are presumably due to Sachsenweger.

Fuhr was sparing of 'Testimonia,' and wisely so: see Butcher, Vol. I, Praef. pp. 8-9. Notes such as these merely clog the apparatus: XX. 1 εὐρούμενος] εὐραμένος A, Hermog. II. cc. (codd. nonnulli); XX. 12 διαλόγαι] δαλύσασθαι Arist. I. 64 sed paulo ante διαλόγαι. Yet on XX. 54 it might have been noted that 'Αντιαλκίδου, the reading of S', is supported by Didymus, *Comm. Col. VII.*

Space might possibly have been saved elsewhere. XXIII. 49 ὁ νόμος δ' οὐκ ἀλάνειν ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἄγειν ἐά: οὐκ is right (cf. XXI. 10, 136; *Ep.* III. 14; Xen. *Mem.* II. 3. 8), and Cobet's οὐχ ὅτι is not worth citing. XX. 54 οὐ λόγος πρῶτον αἰσχρὸς τοῖς σκοπουμένοις: the πρῶτον is 'at first blush', 'not to mention anything else', and supports Dobree's excision of τοῖς σκοπουμένοις; cf. *De Cor.* 236, Ar. *Nub.* 368. XXIV. 8 βουλολημην δ' ἀν ἐμέ τε τυχεῖν ὡν βουλομαι τοῦτον τε παθεῖν ὡν ἄξιος ἐστιν.—'ἐμέ τε] αὐτός τε We. ἐτι τε Bu. at cf. XXI. 204': the text is sound, but I do not see the relevance of XXI. 204. Again at XXV. 50 τι κακὸν οὐ παρέχων; —'κακὸν F Blass cf. XVIII. 48, XIX. 201': Greek idiom demands τι κακὸν ορ τι τῶν κακῶν.

Of the emendations, 'ἀν del. Blass' XXI. 11 should be 'ἀν del. Dobree, Blass, Naber, Stahl'; the deletion of καλῶς XX. 110 belongs not to Herwerden but to Hirschig (*Philol.* 1850), if there is any right of priority in error; αὐτῶν θατέρω, θατέρω δὲ XXIII. 142 is Weber's; the deletion of τὸ XXIV. 176 is not Cobet's but Basse's and should have been accepted; cf. XXIV. *ad fin.*, LI. 12. Cobet's εἰην for εἰμι XXI. 104

is unnecessary. At XXI. 185 τοὺς μὲν καθάρματα, ταὺς δὲ πτωχούς, τοὺς δ' οὐδὲν ὑπολαμβάνον εἶναι, it is odd that Syk. does not accept Markland's τοὺς δ' οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπους ὑπολαμβάνων; cf. §§ 101, 198; and the omission of εἶναι with FA accords with Greek idiom. He ignores Naber's lucubrations in *Mnemosyne* 1903. Perhaps the critical notes might have recorded <οὐδὲν> οὐδὲ XX. 20 Richards; οὐδέ γε τούτων (del. ἔχοντι) XX. 129 Gebauer; φράττων XXI. 17 del. Naber coll. Anecd. Bekk. p. 297 προσηλῶν· καθηλῶν, φραττῶν; οὐκ ἐστρεβλῶσθαι XXI. 195 Naber; πιστεύσων XXV. 66 Richards. At XX. 7 Blass with SY reads τοὺς ἐπὶ (which is a Hellenistic usage): τινας ἐπὶ (γρ. SFAP) is no doubt right (Demos-thenes wants to minimize their number); but the ingenuity of Shackle's τοὺς <καὶ τοὺς> ἐπὶ (C.R. XXVIII. 49) may perhaps entitle it to mention.

The large mass of material has been handled with extraordinary care. I have noted XXI. 198 πτωχοὶ καὶ οὐδὲ the omission of καὶ; XXI. 169 τό γε δοῦναι δίκην the omission of δίκην. Both Butcher and Syk. have ἐν προνοίας XXIII. 24. The Attic form τέθηκα is normal, but both editors have προστέθεικεν XX. 8 and τέθεικεν XX. 99. In XX. 61 ἀν αὐτοῖς τὰς αὐτὰς δῶτε δωρεὰς ἀσπερ Butcher reads ἀσπερ tacite, Syk. with c.n. 'ἀσπερ S'. All other editors read ἀσπερ except Voemel 1841, who however disowns the ἀσπερ in his 1866 edition of the *Leptines*. The retention of ὅτε in ἦν ὅτε πάσαν XXIII. 115 may be an oversight. At XX. 141 there is a cryptic note, '19 del. Syk.': but τοὺς . . . καὶ had already been deleted by Blass, καὶ . . . δημοσίαις by G. H. Schaefer.

The frequency of θέλω without prodelision evades Attic limitations. From εὐρίσκω one desires ηντον and ηγέρκα. At XXIII. 153 ὑπ' αὐτοῦ should be ὑφ' αὐτοῦ (cf. Dyroff, *Die Geschichte des Pronomen reflexivum* II. 66) as elsewhere in infinitival and participial constructions after verba sentiendi et declarandi. At XXV. 40 οὐδὲ ἔνα should be οὐδὲ ἔνα. The form φευδομαρτυρῶν XXIV. 131 is not Attic (see *Ath. Pol.* 59. 7, *Plat. Theaet.* 148B, Cratinus fr. 454). At XXI. 150 Syk.

accepts *πατρίδος τετευχώς* from SYP'; the Attic form *τετυχηκώς* is preserved in FAPcorr.; cf. Rutherford, *New Phrynicus*, p. 483.

XX. 8 ἀ (δ' S') . . . ταῦτ' ἀφελάμεθα Syk. But δ . . . τοῦτ' (γρSFAYP) is supported by § 71.

XXI. 85 οἶος ἡν Syk. rightly with S', not οἶος τ' ἡν.

XXI. 151 τοσούτων . . . τῷ βδελυρῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἀναιδεῖ ἀν βέβιωται. Schultze finds no really comparable instance of an attracted nominative in the Orators. 'LVII. 46 vocabuli ἔξ ὅν usus late vagatur'. And with Syk.'s order the relative is far from its antecedent.

XXII. 61 τῷ δ' ὅτι παῖδας ἐκ πόρνης εἴναι. ὅτι del. Reiske. Its retention is not justified by citing O.C. 385, Xen. *Hell.* VI. 5. 42, nor by any of the references in Kühner-Gerth II. 358.

XXIII. 67 'τοῦτο ποιήσει cum verbo ὅρκον constructum est, quod idem ac ὀμοίσται valet'. Syk. might have cited Thuc. II. 49. 5.

XXIII. 72 ἔως ἀν αἰδέσηται τινὰ τῶν ἐν γένει codd., Harpocr. : αἰδέσηται τις τ. ἐ. γ. App. Francfurtana (which Butcher favours): ἀρέσηται τινὰ τ. ἐ. γ. Weidner. But the consent of the γένεις was required. Syk. somewhat violently suggests αἰδέσωται πάντες οἱ ἐν γένει. Lipsius approves of Weidner's emendation, assuming some inaccuracy of expression.

XXIII. 142 ἐν δὴ Λαμψάκῳ τινὲς ἄνθρωποι γίγνονται δύο. Θερσαγόρας δον' αὐτῷ, θατέρῳ δ' Ἐξήκεστος Syk. with SFY'P. Weber, citing *Il.* XXIV. 527, is hardly convincing. The choice would seem to lie between A's αὐτῶν θατέρῳ, τῷ δὲ and Weber's suggestion αὐτῶν θατέρῃ, θατέρῳ δὲ.

XXIII. 156 ἡ ὑμετέρα εἴτε χρῆ φιλανθρωπία λέγειν εἴθ' ὅτι δήποτε. Syk. cites in defence of the nominative XXI. 69 (which is inconclusive) and Isocr. XV. 50 τῆς ἐμῆς εἴτε βαύλεσθε καλεῖν δυνάμεως εἴτε φιλοσοφίας. *De Cor.* 270 is irrelevant; *De Cor.* 20 and Plato, *Theages* 121C support the accusative. I believe that after λέγειν and the like you may have an accusative or retain an original dative or genitive,

but not an original nominative. Soph. *Ant.* 567 stands by itself.

XXIV. 169 τὸν οὐκ ὠφληκότα. Syk. omits οὐκ on the authority of S, thereby destroying the antithesis with ὡν ἀν ὕμεις καταγνώτε.

XXV. 23 τὸν νόμων (νομίμων Taylor) κρατεῖν ἐφ' οἰς εἰσεπέμψθσαν. Syk. suggests τῶν πολιτῶν, which does not square with the ἐφ' οἰς clause.

XXV. 53 μειζόνων ἀξιώσαντες δωρεῶν ὡς τὸν εὐεργέταν Syk. coll. Lys. VII. 31, Rep. 520C (? 526C). But ἡ καὶ ὡς are constantly confused. Dobree reads ἡ here; Taylor ἡ ὡς in Lysias. Adam's note on *Apol.* 36D does not establish ὡς = ἡ after a comparative in Attic oratory.

XXV. 82 ταῦτα γεωργεῖ, ταῦτ' ἐργάζεται is omitted in A and the text of S. 'post τρέφει transposita velim', a suggestion worth considering.

XXV. 83 καὶ τὸν ὑπὸ τούτου συκοφαντουμένους ἀπεψηφίζοντο del. Dobree. Butcher retains. But ἀποψηφίζεσθαι 'to acquit' takes a genitive of the person acquitted. Syk. brackets in the text; but as FA have the καὶ before ἀπεψηφίζοντο, he suggests καὶ [τὸν . . . τούτου] ἀπεψηφίζοντο (sic).

The work of Drerup has proved that L (the *fidus Achates* of S in the Oxford edition) and O are copies of S and Y respectively. They disappear from the panel of witnesses. The Teubner has by far the fuller and more accurate apparatus, e.g. XXII. 41 'ἀντιλέγειν FAYP corr. : ἐναντία λέγειν SyrFYP' as against 'ἀντιλέγειν vulg. : ἐναντία λέγειν SL' : ἀντία λέγειν L corr.'; XXV. 10 'προειμένα A<sup>2</sup> : προειρημένα SFA'P' as against 'προειμένα] προειρημένα S me teste'. These are of course exceptional, but not isolated, instances. At XXIV. 199 Syk. has 'δν' δ A', Butcher 'δ vulg. δν SO', where δ (Butcher) and not δν (Syk.) is clearly right. In general it is my impression that Sykutris affords more evidence on the MSS. of Demosthenes, Butcher the more Demosthenic text.

W. RENNIE.

University of Glasgow.

## CALLIMACHUS AND OVID.

Maria De COLA: *Callimacho e Ovidio*.  
Pp. 131. Palermo: Trimarchi, 1937.  
Paper, L. 15.

In this brochure, No. 2 of the *Studi Palermitani di Filologia Classica*, the author has collected all the parallels between Callimachus and Ovid, including those revealed by the papyri of Callimachus published as late as 1935. Her method is roughly chronological, successive chapters dealing with Ovid's earlier works, the *Metamorphoses*, the *Fasti*, the *Ibis*. The *Amores* and the *Ars* yield little but verbal echoes. Three themes of the *Heroines* (Phyllis and Demophon, Hero and Leander, Acontius and Cydippe) are argued to have been taken from Callimachus, but to have been treated very differently. The chapter on the *Metamorphoses* probably exaggerates Ovid's debt to Callimachus' technique of story-telling, but Ovid's rhetorical amplification of a motive barely indicated by Callimachus is well illustrated; cp. *Met.* 4. 195 sqq. and *H.* 3. 180-2, *Met.* 8. 743 sqq. and *H.* 6. 37-8. The chapter on the *Fasti* suffers, as the author admits, from the fact that much of the material has already been discussed in the previous chapters: the

lack of unity in the Latin poem, of which she complains, owes more to Callimachus' example than she allows, as new fragments of the *Aetia* will before long reveal. The last chapter, on the *Ibis*, naturally deals with more controversial matter. The author rejects the heresies of Rostagni and, following Zipfel and Martini, decides that Callimachus' poem, like Ovid's, fell into two parts, *devotiones* and *historiae*, but that it was written in hexameters, not elegiacs; cp. *Ov. Ib.* 45-6 and Euphorion's *Xαλιάδες* and *'Απαί*. The striking coincidences in themes between Ovid's *Ibis* and the *Aetia*, as revealed by the *Diegesis*, are explained as due to Callimachus *more suo* briefly repeating in his *Ibis* stories told at greater length in his *Aetia*.

The author is well acquainted with the work of Malten, Heinze, Lafaye, Cahen, and others concerning these topics, and, though the pamphlet contains little that is new, her collection will be useful. The citations from Latin and Greek authors contain a good many misprints; on occasion (e.g. p. 56, n. 1) the process of corruption eludes one.

E. A. BARBER.

Exeter College, Oxford.

## DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS IN THE LOEB LIBRARY.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus: *Roman Antiquities*. With an English translation by Ernest CARY, Ph.D. On the basis of the version of Edward Spelman. (Loeb Classical Library.) In seven volumes. Vol. I. Pp. xlviii+553. London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

SOME works more than others commend themselves in the Loeb Classical Library, and the appearance of the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus is especially to be welcomed. This work has now its most readable form. On the basis of Jacoby's critical edition and Spelman's translation, Dr. Cary has given us a fresh text and a faithful English rendering that preserves the grace, if not the robustness, of its model.

The introduction treats the general character of the history and such

special points as Dionysius' view of the Roman political institutions, his chronology and his sources. The importance of the rhetorical elements in his composition is appreciated. The equally important influence of Peripatetic historical theory, however, has not received its due recognition, and Dr. Cary's references to the choice of subject-matter and the structure of the work, and to the dramatic presentation of tragic situations, need to be supplemented by such a work as Burck's *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius*: here Livy (Bks. I-V) is compared with Dionysius, and the results are as illuminating for Dionysius as for Livy. Language and style receive only summary treatment.

For the text Dr. Cary has considered all the published evidence. In ques-

tions of orthography he returns to the MSS, except in the spelling of Latin proper names. At I, 37, 2 (*έκτρεφούσας*), 58, 2 (*ήκιστα*), II, 10, 2 (*γερηφορίας*), 25, 6 (*έσχατα*), he restores the MS reading; at I, 39, 4 he prefers *κλωπή* to *καλαύροτι*. Old corrections noted in Jacoby reappear at I, 4, 2 (*εύρομένης*), 30, 4 (*έκτήσαντο*), 61, 1 (*Θαυμάσιον*), 63, 1 (*έαρος*), II, 6, 2 (*σημαλίνειν*), and fresh readings are accepted at I, 15, 1 (*σταυρώμασι*), 34, 1 (*στρατείας*), 40, 1 (*ἀπαλλαγὴν*), 73, 3 (*κλῆσιν*), 79, 5 (*περιεσχάτων*), II, 43, 1 (*καρωθεῖς*), 73, 2 (where *κρίνοντες* & *ἄν* is deleted). At I, 52, 4 *Ἐλυμα* is read although *Ἐρυκα* is discussed in a note; at I, 64, 2 *Τυρρηνὸν* is kept but referred to Turnus; and at II, 64, 2 *φλάμα* remains but *φίλα* is suggested. Dr. Cary's own conjecture of *καὶ διηγηματικῆς* at I, 8, 3 is masterly, and *Κυριίον* for *Κολλίον* at II, 70, 1 shows a firmness which might perhaps have been extended to bracketing *σχεσίω τῆς* *Ιδῆς* at I, 55, 4.

In I, 28, 2 *σιλλούσιν ἀλλήλους ρήματα* is retained and translated 'each scoffs at words used by the other'. This is required by the context, but the reading can only mean 'each scoffs at the other in words': the simplest correction is *ἀλλήλους*. In I, 68, 1 *δοκούσιν γάρ μοι . . . οἱ παλαιοί* is deleted, without however accounting for the gloss

on  $\theta$  and  $\delta$ , and it is probably best to read *<δέον> Πενάτας*. At I, 82, 2 *ὑπηρετήσειν* can scarcely mean 'likely to serve their purpose', and some such addition as *εὐ* seems necessary. The context in I, 84, 4 makes it plain that Dionysius did actually refer to *Δούπας* as a Greek term. In I, 87, 1 the question of equality hardly arises: the strife between Romulus and Remus is for the leadership, and their secret *φιλαρχία* is contrasted with their claims of justification in the omen: *σημεῖον* thus appears preferable to *μὴ μεῖον*. At the well-known difficulty in I, 25, 3 it would perhaps be better to bracket *έν* and read simply *ἔχει . . . Ἀκτῆς . . . μνήμην*. At I, 80, 3 Schnelle's *οὐρὸς* needs the support of the rest of his supplement, for which see Jacoby.

The reference to Pauly-Wissowa in the introduction should be to columns, not pages. Müller *F.H.G.* and the *L.C.L.* now and then appear in a longer form. At I, 27, 3 read *διανείμαντας* for *δεινείμαντας*.

These, however, are only the natural slips of the pen, and the work in general maintains a high level of accuracy and shows consistent good judgment. Dr. Cary is to be congratulated on an exemplary opening to his edition.

A. H. McDONALD.

*University College, Nottingham.*

#### NEW TEXTS OF PLUTARCH.

Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae. *Galba et Otho*. Recognovit K. ZIEGLER. Pp. xii + 60. (Bibliotheca . . . Teubneriana, No. 1700.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1935. Stiff paper, (export price) RM. 1.80.

Plutarch's *Moralia*. In fourteen volumes. Volume X: 771E-854D. With an English translation by H. N. FOWLER. Pp. xii + 491. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

DESPITE the title-page of the Teubner *Galba* and *Otho*, those lives are not 'parallel'; they have come down to us among the *Moralia*; and only by a little research does one discover that this booklet is a puny fourth, a tantony

brother, to Lindsborg and Ziegler's three stout pairs of twins.

Dr Ziegler has done his usual good service to the text, which yet remains bad, as he well knows; it is unlike him to cover a fault with such a note as his *λαβὼν* subaudi *ξυρόν* on 1067C (*Oth.* 2). He has made some good conjectures; but I miss some noteworthy old ones. As such should doubtless be reckoned *γεγαμημένη* in 1056E (*Galb.* 9), though it is reported from a MS.

After Volume V of the Loeb *Moralia* comes Volume X with a new editor.

First a few notes on the translation. In 777B *ἔωλον* is not 'out of date' but 'hackneyed'; in 783D *πράττειν* refers not to conduct but to condition or lot; in 810A *σικοφάντας* is not 'black-

mailers'; in 817D 'come forward' represents not *παρεῖναι* but *παριέναι*, which should be read; in 831D, *εἴπειμίαν* is not 'good reputation' but 'civil rights', *ἀντέχεται* not 'struggles against' but 'clutches'; in 839E *χαρακτήρος* is not 'character' but 'style'; in 785B *όμολογουμένως*, and in 840C *δημαρχοῦντος*, is misunderstood. In 805C, 808A, 810A, 844A, why 'Claudius' for *Κλάδιος*, 'Charicles' for *Χαρίκλωφ*, 'Thraseas' for *Θρασέαν*, 'of Paeonia' for *Παιανίεν*? To say, at 837F, that Isocrates composed his *Panegyricus* 'ten (but some say fifteen) years before his death' is untrue both to the fact and to the Greek.

The notes are helpful. A reviewer has pointed out a confusion of dates in notes *c* and *d* on 835D, and of orators in note *b* on 840F. It is strange to read of Dinarchus, in a note on 850E, that 'only quoted fragments of his writings are extant'.

Besides misprints which do little

harm I have noticed *αὐτὸν* for *αὐτὸν*, which seems to be given by the MSS, in 781A.

Of the translator's conjectures one is very good: *εἴλα τειχίζωμεν* (for *εἴλα ἀττικῷ μὲν*) in 826B, from the passage of Pindar which is there paraphrased. Similarly, from a passage of Plato, one of the general editors of the series has restored *γῆπερ* (for *ὅπερ*) in 801D. Elsewhere also this editor has been busy with the text, but to no good purpose. At 776B his conjecture is wrongheaded; at 794A *ἀπαχθὲς*, or even, if that is what he meant, *ἀτεχθὲς*, is inferior to the *ἐπαχθὲς* of the MSS (for *εἰ καὶ φορτικὸν* see 456E).

On the whole this volume does not quite come up to the standard set by Babbitt. The translator pleads illness, during which the general editors made changes and additions against his will. More power to his elbow!

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

### PLUTARCH ON THE PYTHIA'S ORACLES.

Robert FLACELIÈRE: Plutarque: *Sur les Oracles de la Pythie*. Texte et traduction avec une introduction et des notes. Pp. 179; 1 plan. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon (Lettres): III, 4.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1937. Paper.

THE *de Pythiae oraculis* is one of the most charming little works in classical literature. What would any lover of antiquity give for the possibility of going round the sights of his beloved Delphi with that gentleman of the old school, Plutarch, as his guide? There is no stone in the place that he does not know about and care for with as deep a feeling as any Dean for the treasures of his Cathedral. He may not be a great original thinker, but as a companion, how well stored is his mind! Greek literature, the whole of it, he has at his finger-tips, and his habit of quoting from memory has been a source of vexation and occupation to pedants ever since. To be sure, this account of part of such an afternoon is derivative in plan of composition and besides owes debts of phrase and language, which

M. Flacelière duly points out, to Plato: but the treatise is worthy of its models and is no mere pinchbeck imitation. Plutarch, it is true, has a serious purpose in view which perhaps is not so serious for readers today, for whom it can only retain an 'academic interest'. But how gentlemanly are the disputationes on these burning topics! One is carried back to memories of the happier days of the nineteenth century when literature, art and scholarship were more frequently ornamented by such amateurs as those in Plutarch's company.

This edition is well done. The editor has been thorough, though he is too sound a lover of Plutarch, whose works he evidently knows well, to play the pedant. The text does not vary a great deal (how should it?) from the Teubner. The translation, where I have tested it, is accurate, and it is pleasant to read. The introduction includes sensible discussions on the form, style and language, Plutarch's views on Delphic inspiration, Stoics and Epicureans, and the monuments mentioned in the treatise. As befits a former student of the French

School at Athens the editor has also given us a very good plan of the site. He thinks, and I for one am inclined to believe that he may be right, that this is one of Plutarch's very latest works. But there is no external evidence, and such

internal or circumstantial evidence as may be collected one way or the other would not suffice to hang a cat.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

*King's College, London.*

### IAMBЛИCHUS' LIFE OF PYTHAGORAS.

L. DEUBNER: *Iamblichī de vita Pythagorica liber.* Pp. xx + 158. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1937. Export prices: paper, RM. 6.60; bound, 7.50.

THE divine Iamblichus does not now command the admiration accorded him by his contemporaries and immediate successors, and is fortunate to have found another editor for his Life of Pythagoras after the lapse of half a century. The text presents no serious palaeographical problems. Holsten, Cobet, Nauck, Pistelli and the present editor agree that Laurentianus 86, 3 (F) is the archetype of all other existing MSS. of the works of Iamblichus. For this edition F has been collated by Deubner more than once, and he ventures to believe that he has extracted the last grain of information from it. He rarely cites any other MS., and then only for quite simple corrections.

Iamblichus' neo-Pythagorean manifesto is not on the whole a very attractive work, being a cento of extracts from previous writers, embellished with his own forty-parson-power eloquence. He lifts *verbatim* the bulk of Porphyry's Life of Pythagoras without acknowledgement. The latter, a scholar, always named his sources, the former, a propagandist, hardly ever. He makes his book tedious by giving long pieces a second or even a third time. Still the Life contains delightful passages, as where the rough sailors watch Pythagoras descending the slopes of Mount Carmel, and when he asks them 'Are you bound for Egypt?' take him on board and during the whole voyage suit their language and conduct to the presence of the youthful saint. The

text of this edition is printed in large, clear type. At the foot of each page Deubner gives copious references to sources and parallel passages. (Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* V. 3 § 9, after Heraclides Ponticus, might be added to the note on p. 31, l. 22). He is a conservative critic and thinks that 'correction' has been overdone by Cobet and Nauck—a common complaint of editors in these days. At p. 34, l. 1 παρὰ θεῶν εἰσὶν ἀγγελίαι τινὲς καὶ αὐτὸι F, *ai* (*καὶ*) αὐταὶ Porph., Nauck on p. xxii of his edition of Porphyry suggested *καὶ ὅταν*, which is better than Scaliger's *καὶ ἀεροί*, adopted by Deubner. On the other hand Nauck might have availed himself of the correction afforded by Iamblichus p. 21, l. 6 to Porphyry p. 30, l. 3, where *ἔτι . . . ἐπισυρμένης* should certainly be read for *ἔπι . . . ἐπισυρμένοις*. At p. 43, l. 5 why does Deubner read *γενσάμενος . . . πολυτελείας* *ἀς* *οὐκ ἔχρην τοι γενέσθαι δεύτερον*, where *γενέσθαι*, given by Küster, makes excellent sense? At p. 67, l. 10 *ἐκάστην ἀφ' ἐκάστης ἐξήργησεν, ὀλκήν* the comma, I think, should be omitted; otherwise *ἐκάστην* will refer to *χορδήν*. At p. 87, l. 4 the words *ταύτην πράτην γονήν κ.τ.λ.*, after a warning against cleaning one's teeth with a *σχῖνος*, give no sense. Deubner makes no comment. Küster wanted to put them after l. 16 of the previous page, but even there they will hardly do. If F and Deubner are right, Liddell-and-Scott should be enriched with the curious word *ἐπεγρία—ολιγούπνιαν καὶ ἐπεγρίαν* p. 10 l. 14, *ἐπεγρίας τοῦ λογισμοῦ* p. 38, l. 19, and in two other passages.

J. H. SLEEMAN.

*Royal Holloway College.*

## THE ORIGINS OF ROMAN VERSE.

Giorgio PASQUALI: *Preistoria della poesia romana*. Pp. xii + 83. Florence: Sansoni, 1936. Paper, L. 12.

IT would appear that the present state of the Saturnian problem can be summed up as follows. There is no question of mere accentual verse; for, to leave aside, once and for all, arguments of a more general character, (1) certain places in the line are, either individually or interdependently, subject to quantitative regulation, although their liberty would not affect the distribution of the accents; (2) *bibreve* occurs as equivalent of *longum*. On the other hand, a purely quantitative theory is faced with serious difficulties: (1) unrestricted use of final short as *longum* before the caesura of the first and of the second hemistich, and, perhaps, also at the end of the first foot; (2) the tendency (either cause or consequence of the caesura in both hemistichs) to let the verse consist of five words (two disyllables and three trisyllables), a feature alien to quantitative metre.

When, therefore, Pasquali opens his work by denouncing it as absurd to think of anything but a quantitative Saturnian, he marks himself as biased; when he says that an accentual theory is held only in the worst handbooks of Roman literature, we should like to refer him, e.g., to Teuffel-Kroll. Whoever advocates a purely quantitative Saturnian should cope with the difficulties mentioned above, and should also not pass over in silence the question how the Saturnian could have survived a period of initial stress-accent (or *intensité initiale*) without prejudice to its quantitative character.

The contents of Pasquali's book are, in a nutshell, these: (1) Leo's proof that every variety of the *cola saturnii* has its counterpart in Greek metre does not exclude the possibility of coincidence; in order to rule this out P. demonstrates that, as in the Saturnian, these varieties appear as equivalent and interchangeable in the cantica of Greek drama. (However, the evidence is more convincing for the first hemistich than for the three main types of the second hemistich, viz. *ithyphallicus*, iambic

diameter and *reizianum*, and it will be argued that interchangeability in a *canticum* is not the same as indiscriminate use in stichic verse.) (2) The Saturnian does not go back to Indo-European origins. (True, there is penetrating and absolutely convincing argument against Leo, whose *wissenschaftsgeschichtliche* position is well analysed—would that scholars could turn similar searchlights on themselves—and against Meillet's *Origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs*; but Irish verse [Lindsay E.L.V. p. 9 f.] is not mentioned in this connection, and relation to Germanic verse is ruled out only by the thesis that the Saturnian is not accentual.) (3) The *cola saturnii* were borrowed from Greece, where they are old and popular, and joined to the Saturnian by an unknown Roman genius, not after the end of the fourth century, and probably much earlier. (I cannot here deal with the chapter called *Il saturnio e il senso ritmico romano*, but neither is the *versus reizianus* a good parallel for the joining of the *cola saturnii*, nor do certain divergences of Latin dramatic metre from the Greek models provide an explanation for the introduction of the caesurae in the Saturnian.) (4) There are no Italic Saturnians; those from Corfinium (if certain) are due to Roman influence. (5) A review of the political and cultural situation of archaic Rome suggests the close of the sixth century as the most likely date for the reception of the *cola saturnii* from Greece. (6) Thus, the only original form of Italic poetry is the *carmen*; P. analyses one example, the prayer to Mars at the *Suovetaurilia*, and introduces the helpful notion of 'transition' (*trapasso*), a passage of merely functional value which does not form part of the poetical structure.

This summary of necessity cannot do justice to the brilliant qualities of Pasquali's book; exuberance of ideas, amazing yet never cumbersome erudition (most impressively displayed in the chapter *La cultura di Roma arcaica*) and an almost playful keenness of appreciation mark it, despite the shortcomings of its main thesis, as the work of a great scholar and original personality.

Two minor slips may be noted. *capitibus opertis* figures as a reizianum on p. 10, as an ithyphallicus on p. 21. On p. 29 Leo's monosyllabic *neve* (*neu*) in the *Carmen Arvale* is defended against Nacinovich; but the evidence cited in

support of *apocope* might have warned against introducing a slurred conversational form into an archaic hymn.

OTTO SKUTSCH.

St. Andrews.

### SPEECHES OF CICERO IN THE LOEB SERIES.

Cicero, *In Catilinam I-IV, Pro Murena, Pro Sulla, Pro Flacco*, with an English translation by Louis E. LORD. Pp. viii + 486. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THE Catilinarian Orations make grand and salutary reading; their passionate truth still glows, their savour is not yet impaired by the *crambe repetita* of Cicero's own subsequent serving; and what a thrilling story still! But they are difficult to translate, like all Cicero's speeches; Cicero cannot be approached casually, and it should not be forgotten that he was an orator. Professor Lord's translation seldom rises above good sixth-form level, and in accuracy sinks far below. The vocabulary is limited and static; *audacia* is nearly always 'audacity', *modestia* 'modesty', *honor* 'honour', *dignitas* 'dignity', *conscientia* 'conscience', *imperium* 'government', irrespective of context<sup>1</sup>; little attempt is made to reproduce effects of assonance and rhythmic balance. Compare this version of the *pro Flacco* with such passages as Mr. Webster has translated (there are too few of them) in his edition, and the difference is obvious.

The translation teems with inaccuracies; here are some of the worst. *Cat.* i. 19 *quam longe videtur a carcere abesse debere*, 'how long do you think a man should be free from prison?'; iii. 25 *in hoc uno . . . maximo bello*, 'in this war alone, the greatest . . . war'; *Mur.* 10 *ut tecum agam, non secus ac si meus esset frater . . . isto in loco*, 'I shall act towards you, as if you were the dearest of my brothers'; 25 *scriba quidam, Cn. Flavius*, 'a clerk of Gnaeus Flavius';

40 *commovebar*, 'I enjoyed deeply' (it means the opposite); 69 *frequentiam . . . gratuitam non modo dignitati nullius unquam sed ne voluntati quidem defuisse*, 'that a throng voluntarily performing this duty never compromised the dignity nor even the good standing of any man'; *Sull.* 75 *non cadit in hos mores . . . ista suspicio*, 'that suspicion does not fall on habits like these'; *Flacc.* 14 *qui domi stare non poterant*, 'who could not stay at home' (it means 'were bankrupt'); 43 *decreto scribendo primum video adfuisse Lysaniam*, 'I see that L. was first in the record'; 45 *quem iudicatum hic duxit Hermippus*, 'whom H. brought here to attend the trial'; 52 *apud nos noti, inter suos nobiles*, 'other men among their own nobles known to us'; 79 *mitto quod aliena, mitto quod possessa per vim*, etc., 'I am not discussing the property that belonged to others, nor what you held by violence'; 90 *talenta quinquaginta*, 'five talents'. In *Flacc.* 6 the editor translates Clark's text but does not print it; in the Milan fragment (p. 368, *si neque tota*, etc.), the reading given is unintelligible and unrelated to the English; there are various omissions, dittographies, and misprints (including a horrible accident on p. 462).

*Quousque tandem?* Much more of this bungling could be quoted, and minor blemishes are legion. Accuracy, wrote Housman, is a duty and not a virtue: when will the Loeb editors realize that they ruin the series by issuing such translations as these? This particular volume, though no worse than some others in the Library, is alike useless to the scholar, perilous to the young student, and unfair to the man in the street.

R. G. AUSTIN.

University College, Cardiff.

<sup>1</sup> Contrast, however, 'daily chores' (*operae cotidiane*, *Mur.* 21); 'a quarrelsome hoodlum' (*scurrarum convicium*, *ibid.* 13).

## THE LOEB AMMIANUS.

*Ammianus Marcellinus.* With an English translation by J. C. ROLFE. In three volumes. II. [Books XX-XXVI.] Pp. viii+683; portrait, 2 pages of illustrations, 2 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THIS volume is even more unsatisfactory than the first. Here are some of Mr. Rolfe's renderings: XX. 7. 9 *contemplabiliter*, 'obviously' ('deliberately'); XXI. 1. 7 *hand leue*, 'difficult' ('important'); XXII. 6. 2 *graculorum*, 'cranes'; 15. 22 *squalentes*, 'muddy'; 16. 14 *aprico spiritu immurmurantes*, 'that welcome morning with sunny breath'; XXIII. 6. 28 *quadratae figurae*, 'a triangle'; XXIV. 4. 19 *rerum momenta magnarum*, 'the accomplishment of a great undertaking'; 4. 23 *de Victorum numero miles*, 'a soldier of the cohort of Victor'; 6. 15 *ignoratus ubique dux esset an miles*, 'whether more as leader everywhere or as soldier none could say'; XXV. 4. 22 *ab ipso capite usque unguium summitates*, 'from his head to the ends of his finger-nails'; XXVI. 1. 3 *uolubilium casuum diritate*, 'rolling flood of disasters'; 1. 5 *conueniens*, 'near at hand'; 1. 8 *uerbo tenuis*, 'in a word'; 2. 9 *moribus temperatum*, 'of tried character'; 6. 5 *factionis conscos*, 'accomplices in his action'; 7. 1 *in insoliti casus ambigua adsciscebantur*, 'were induced to hesitating participation in the dubious enterprise'. Other mistakes occur at XX. 5. 7; 11. 15; 11. 22; XXII. 14. 2; XXIII. 6. 32; 6. 85; XXIV. 3. 14; 4. 20; XXV. 1. 16; 6. 2; 8. 18; XXVI. 9. 3; and elsewhere. In about ten places words are untranslated.

Here are some more of the pieces of misinformation in this volume: p. 41, Nisibis was besieged by the Persians in 337, 350 and 359; p. 233, Orsilochus means 'huntsress of bears'; p. 294, the nom. plur. of *σύντηξις* is *σύντηγμα*, as was declared before on p. 347 of the first volume; p. 309, the king of Cyrene died in 97 B.C. but Cyrene first became a Roman province in 68 B.C.; p. 310,

Diocletian and Aristobulus were consuls in 363; p. 331, Poliorcetes means 'sacker of cities'; p. 450, M. Aurelius Carus was emperor from 282 to 285; p. 570, Feb. 24 is *a. d. sextile Kal. Mart.*; p. 596, Procopius was Julian's nephew; p. 663, when Amm. speaks of Cynossema in XXII. 8. 4 he refers to a promontory of Caria. The events of XXI and XXII belong to 360-362, but Mr. R. at the head of the page wrongly assigns them all to 363; most of XXV belongs to 363, but Mr. R. dates it all in 364. At XXIII. 6. 8 the elements are not 'waters' but water and land. At XXII. 9. 1 why quote Soph. *Ajax*, 777 rather than Aesch. *Septem*, 425 or other such passages? At XXII. 14. 5, misunderstood in *T.L.L.* V. 347. 36, the passage to quote is Themistius, *Or. VII*, 95A. On p. 541 Mr. R. observes that Jovian's wife, Charito, is 'not given in *T.L.L.* s.v.' Of course not; her name is known from Zonaras.

At XXII. 13. 1 Mr. R. adopts a foolish conjecture by Damsté, presumably because he does not understand that *simulacrum Olympiaci Iouis imitamenti aequiparans magnitudinem* means 'a statue equal in size to the statue of Zeus at Olympia'. At XXIII. 1. 6 Mr. R. writes *scaeum*; that was conjectured by Brakman in 1909. At XXIV. 5. 3, without giving the reading of V, he writes *pingua*; that was conjectured by Petschenig in 1891. At XXIV. 5. 8 he reverses *splendore nitens*; that was done by W. A. Baehrens in 1925. At XXIII. 3. 7 he writes *annuales*; others have known better. The note at XXII. 15. 21 and the punctuation *ad speciem equorum bifidos habentes, unguis caudasque breues* have to be seen to be believed.

It remains to say that there are 96 errors in the critical notes, of which 15 are repeated from Clark, and that the book contains at least 232 misprints, of which 82 disfigure the text.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

*King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

## ORIGINES ETRUSCAE.

Pericle DUCATI: *Le problème étrusque*.  
Pp. 207; 8 plates. Paris: Leroux,  
1938. Paper, 40 francs.

DESPITE its modest size and price, this work is not so much an essay on the Etruscan problem as a little encyclopaedia of the subject, from the points of view of archaeology, linguistics and comparative religion. This object is attained by severe compression of text, not, however, resulting in obscurity, thanks to the clear style of the author, and very abundant documentation. Not only does the bibliography fill ten pages of small and closely printed type, but the first part of the work (*Histoire du problème*, pp. 3-56) gives a brief account of every work of any importance, however fantastic its conclusions, which has been devoted to the question, besides listing and commenting upon the passages, all too few in number, which survive to tell us what the ancients thought about the matter. The second section (*Les données du problème*, pp. 59-165) sets before the reader, in orderly array, everything which can shed any light, starting with Livy and the criticisms of Herodotus which Dionysius of Halicarnassus records, continuing with a clear summary of the archaeological evidence, passing thence to the vexed question of the language and adding an account of the religion of Etruria, so far as it is known from ancient texts and modern excavations. The short concluding section gives the author's reasons for his own views.

These are briefly as follows. Putting all hypotheses together, either the Etruscans are autochthonous in Italy or they are not. If they are not, they must have come either from elsewhere in Europe or from outside Europe, the only practicable place being Asia, and if so, then probably Asia Minor, for only very fantastic theories bring them from farther afield. If they came from Asia, the likely route is by sea, and there are but two coasts for them to

land on, the Adriatic and the Tyrrhenian. To suppose them autochthonous is to fly in the face of the archaeological evidence, which shows us people of a higher culture invading Italy and settling in Tuscany. To bring them from some other quarter of Europe again meets with archaeological difficulties, since the Villanovans are not Etruscans, the Etruscan language is not Wiro, whereas probably that of the Villanovans was, and finally the other European invaders came from the north, whereas we find the currents of Etruscan influence setting northward and inland from the general direction of the south of Etruria. If they came from outside Europe by sea, again it is extremely difficult to picture them landing on the Adriatic coast, for again archaeology testifies to the Tyrrhenian settlements as the oldest. Therefore the account given by Herodotus, that they were Lydian immigrants, however fanciful its details may be, is essentially right. This is confirmed by the facts that language, religion and some other cultural features suggest the basin of the Aegean and an early origin, earlier than the spread of Wiro influence.

As to the manner of their coming, Professor Ducati supposes that they arrived late enough (during the course of the eighth century B.C.) to find Greeks and Phoenicians already in possession of the most desirable sites in Sicily; that they therefore turned up the west coast of Italy, avoiding the almost harbourless Adriatic, and finding a region to their liking, proceeded to take possession of site after site in it, conquering or driving out, but not, apparently, assimilating the Villanovans (Umbrians), and imposing their language and culture over a wide area. The reviewer is in general agreement, differing with regard to certain details and some of the arguments, which there is not space to criticize here.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

## ANTIQUITATES DIVINAE.

Th. ZIELIŃSKI: *Iresione*, tomus II, dissertationes ad antiquorum religionem pertinentes continens. (Eus supplementa, Vol. 8.) Pp. v + 479; 6 illustrations on 3 plates. Lwów: Polish Philological Society (Paris, 'Les Belles Lettres'), 1936. Paper.

THIS book consists of eighteen essays or articles (Nos. X-XVIII are misnumbered XI-XIX) in German, French, Italian (one of these is translated from a Polish original), English and Latin. Save for the last, a protest against some strictures of Pfister, they are republications, covering about forty years of the venerable author's active life. Hence in places there is a certain amount that is obsolete, particularly in the theories assumed; to-day we should hardly give much consideration to the fundamental postulate of No. III, that the story of Orestes is a myth and not a saga, unless it was shown to be closely linked with one of the now fashionable ritual complexes, nor would all that is said in No. IV about the earliest Roman religion pass unchallenged. Indeed, Professor Zieliński does not expect complete agreement: 'mag nur', he says (p. 146) 'der kundige Leser hin und wieder sein Fragezeichen an den Rand schreiben; dass er es allzuoft wird tun müssen, glaube ich dennoch nicht'. But question-marks or none (the reviewer makes no attempt, for reasons of space, to give a complete list of his), the book is stimulating, as was likely from the author's principle (p. 464), 'die Antike soll uns nicht Norm, sondern Same zu eigenem Schaffen sein'.

One of the most prominent features of all the essays is their ingenuity. This unfortunately goes a little beyond bounds at times, as in No. XVI, *de Helene simulacro*, which conjures up, chiefly from Aesch., *Ag.* 414 *sqq.* and Stesichorus' palinode, a theory that originally a statue of Aphrodite came to life and took Helen's place while she was away, or No. V, *Hermes und die Hermetik*, where, alongside the sound principle that Hermetic theology is essentially of Greek origin (he distinguishes a Platonic, a Peripatetic and a

Pantheistic strain), we get the extremely hazardous suggestion that one particular influence was Arcadian, coming through Kyrene in the third century B.C. But there is always something to learn and something which it is stimulating to criticize, as in No. I (*Erysichthon*), which makes the very good point that the tale of Mestra, although her position as Erysichthon's daughter is secondary, is in itself old and popular. It is not often that we get actual misstatements (there is one on p. 251; so far from never touching Athena 'même du bout du doigt', Aristophanes makes merry with her at some length, *Equit.* 1090, 1169 *sqq.*), but rash statements (as on p. 263, that the happiness of Odysseus' people around him means that his grave will be a hero-shrine dispensing blessings) are much commoner.

Still more interesting and important is Zieliński's attitude towards the study of ancient religion generally. He has two main postulates; one is that 'die antike Religion ist das wahre Alte Testament unseres Christentums' (p. 147), meaning not simply, *e.g.*, that, as he shows in No. VI, the seven deadly sins are of planetary origin, conveyed to Christianity through ancient popular ethics, into which they were perhaps introduced by Poseidonios, or that, as is demonstrated in No. IV (*Rom und seine Gottheit*), the Christian Church of Rome has shown more than a little of the pre-Christian broad-mindedness towards other creeds, but that, apart from specifically new doctrines, the whole Christian system has its basis in classical thought and belief, and not in the Hebrew system. The other is that to understand, as opposed to merely listing facts about, ancient or any other religion, the investigator should himself be a religious man,<sup>1</sup> or he cannot realize

<sup>1</sup> The fact that his own religion is that of the Church of Rome has given rise to some singularly pointless attacks on his views. His attitude would be essentially the same if he were a pious Lutheran or a devout follower of Gautama or Mohammed, provided that he kept the liberal attitude and absence of any kind of fanaticism which marks his work. A certain dislike of Jews and Judaism may here and there be detected.

what the worshippers at a strange shrine felt. There is an element of truth in this; to be incapable of any sympathy, even imaginative, with the devout is to be much in the position of a tone-deaf man writing on music. But to hold firmly and affectionately to some creed which makes claims on the emotions as well as the reason is apt to bias the historian in the direction of unconsciously identifying the ancient faithful, especially if he likes their views and ritual, with followers of his own doctrine. Just so, in another

sphere, to Grote all Greek statesmen whom he admired were very like English Liberals of the nineteenth century. In the case under discussion, there is no doubt that Zieliński knows a pious ancient when he reads about him; it is often seriously to be doubted if he does not attribute to him the wrong species of piety, or mistake for religious thought or emotion that which in historical fact was generated quite otherwise.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

### EARLY GREEK WEIGHTS.

N. VALMIN: *Poids préhistoriques grecs de Malthi en Messénie*. Pp. 44. (Bulletin de la Société royale des Lettres de Lund, 1936-1937, II.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1937. Paper, 2s.

GREEK prehistoric metrology remains, as this important pamphlet points out, in large measure indefinite. Valmin has, however, added something of value to our knowledge and has acquainted himself with most of the past work on the subject. He has observed that in the modern Greek village the shopkeeper frequently employs as weights all sorts of oddments (tossing into the scales coins, buttons, nails and shells the weights of which in terms of *drámmia* are known), and from this he has concluded that the bronze-age shopkeeper may have used an equally varied collection of weights. Consequently he has carefully studied all such objects, found on the acropolis of Malthi, as might possibly be weights. They are almost all of the Middle Helladic or Late Helladic period. They were, it is admitted, weighed on the shop-scales of the local grocer; but, since accurate weights were acquired in Athens to control the weighing, the records given may be trusted. Among polygonal stones, cubes, spheres, hemispheres, and truncated cones there are some things that are probably weights, and others that perhaps filled some other purpose, such as that of loom-weights or spindle-whorls.

Eleven tables help to explain the author's conclusions about weight-standards, and he believes that there is evidence for no less than seven different standards, simultaneously employed, in the prehistoric town of Malthi. Even if we cannot accept all these, three standards do seem to emerge. The first (A) appears to have a unit of about 8 grammes, the second (B) one of about 9·4, and the third (C) one of about 11·2. (A) is nothing less than the historical 'Euboic' (later Attic) unit which Ridge-way long ago identified with the Homeric gold-talent, and for which other bronze-age evidence exists. (B) is the Egyptian *Kedet*, or *Kité*, a standard long in use. (C) is the weight employed as a unit for the earliest known coins of Corcyra. There is no reason why this standard should not have been used by merchants for many centuries before the Corcyraeans adopted it.

The most characteristic Peloponnesian standard of classical times does not appear. This lack is to be expected, for (as I pointed out in my study of the early coins of Athens) the Aeginetan standard was probably the invention of Pheidon of Argos, resulting from the iron-to-silver ratio of his day.

The article is written with a clarity and liveliness not always associated with metrology. I note one slip on p. 16, where *quadrans* should be *triens*, since it is the latter which is marked by four pellets.

C. T. SELTMAN.

*Queens' College, Cambridge.*

## STUDIES AT DELPHI.

*Au Musée de Delphes: recherches sur quelques monuments archaïques et leur décor sculpté.* Par P. DE LA COSTE-MESSELIÈRE. Pp. vi + 503; 20 figures, 50 plates. (Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fasc. 138.) Paris: Boccard, 1936. Paper.

THIS is the most important book outside the regular series of the *Fouilles* which has hitherto been published on Delphi. The author deals with the so-called Sicyonian sculptured metopes and the building from which they are derived, and with the sculptures of the Siphnian treasury. The former, he argues, are derived from a rectangular building dating from 560-550, itself Sicyonian, which stood side by side with a circular building. Both were pulled down and their remains used in the actual Sicyonian Treasury. He firmly rejects Dinsmoor's view that the earlier building was Syracusan. He examines the Sicyonian reliefs in the greatest detail. Many new facts emerge. The relief of a boar, he thinks, was the central panel of a triptych of panels which alternated with triglyphs. The other two contained scenes of huntsmen. The relief of the Argo has, as he points out, no iconographical history. He reconstitutes it as a side view of the ship, with the musicians aboard, but with the Dioscuri in front of the ship, not, as is sometimes thought, astride it. Here again two panels interrupted by a triglyph complete the scene. He brings numerous parallels in vase-painting and *Klein-kunst* to illustrate the character of each panel. He concludes that the style of these reliefs, which, as he points out, still preserve an *éclat d'atelier*, is certainly Sicyonian, allied to the minia-

ture style of Protocorinthian painting, and what he calls 'Hesiodic' in manner. The stone from which the two buildings that preceded the actual treasury were made can be assigned to a specific quarry near Sicyon. The inscriptions preserved give no clue to origin since they are in the Delphic alphabet.

On the Siphnian frieze and treasury he makes the valuable comment that the marble from which it is made is that of Ios, or of Siphnos itself, not Parian. This marble is of poor quality and incapable of certain kinds of cutting. Consequently the character of the architectural ornament was largely conditioned by the quality of the marble. On this basis he analyses the formal design. His reproduction of the superb slab of cornice on Pl. XXII gives us an example of the finest of all the Siphnian ornament. The material may have conditioned the artist, but it did not hamper him. This ornament remains one of the finest ever achieved by an Ionian architect. The author compares the architectural design with that on the Massaliot and 'Cnidian' treasuries. He also has valuable comments on the nature of the first of those two ornate buildings.

M. de la Coste-Messelière is to be warmly congratulated on a masterly work, packed with new information and with useful summaries of facts hitherto scattered in the fascicles of the *Fouilles*. His stylistic analysis of the two groups of sculpture will remain a standard study for many years. His wealth of additional matter offered to the readers in his footnotes will well serve all students of Greek art. Our knowledge of Delphi is enormously enriched by his work.

STANLEY CASSON.

New College, Oxford.

## GREEK AND ROMAN NAVAL WARFARE.

William Ledyard RODGERS: *Greek and Roman Naval Warfare.* Pp. xv + 555; 12 plates, 23 diagrams, 28 maps. Annapolis: U.S. Naval Institute (London: Stevens and Brown), 1937. Cloth, 27s.

THIS book, by a retired Vice-Admiral of the U.S. Navy, is a concise history of the Mediterranean world from Marathon to Actium, written from the naval standpoint and elaborating naval matters. Naval warfare, in the author's

view, is secondary to land warfare, and its object is always to protect or control commerce; the economic motive is therefore stressed throughout, and great attention is paid to questions of supply, which adds to the reality of the presentation. Some of the story is well known, like the influence of sea-power in the Second Punic War, but some is not; the sketch, e.g., of Caesar's campaigns as seen from the sea, and of the way in which, starting from zero, he overcame the handicap of enemy sea-power, is, I think, new, and certainly interesting. The author makes many good points throughout, and often throws fresh light on a battle; I may note especially Cyzicus, Arginusae, and Polyanthes' battle in the Peloponnesian War, and in the First Punic War Ecnomus and Drepanum. Chios remains obscure, because Polybius is incomprehensible; and I do not blame him for rejecting my Actium, for it takes time to grasp primary evidence where late secondary versions have become stereotyped. The development of tactics is carefully followed, with just views on the question of ramming versus boarding. He knows that naval tactics followed land tactics; he might have noted the one exception—that Ecnomus would have been Cannae, only the Carthaginian centre broke—and might have emphasized that Demetrius made the turning of the enemy *sea-wing* (second Salamis) dominant tactics for very many years. He can be properly distrustful of ancient figures, like those of Diodorus on Dionysius; for the First Punic War he takes my numbers, which at least make sense. But unfortunately he makes Xerxes' fleet too large, which rather spoils that campaign; as he praises Munro's reconstruction, he should have followed his numbers (i.e. mine with one certain correction); anything larger is impossible. He does criticize Herodotus; but the true criticism is, that once Greeks had occupied the Persian Empire, and knew, figures (beginning with Hieronymus) fall like plummets. No two people agree about Salamis; his is a shoving match, like a hoplite battle. But he has an interesting suggestion as to why the Persian leaders ever fought

it: the season was getting late for galleys, and they dared not wait. Is it possible that Xerxes had already heard of the Babylonian revolt, and dared not wait either?

As to the ships, he rightly holds that principles must have been the same as with their mediaeval successors, of which his knowledge is very considerable. One excellent feature is his mass of statistics on matters like oar-power and displacement; he is in consequence very good on speeds in different circumstances, which I trust are now settled. He assumes without argument that the quinquereme had five men to the oar; that has in fact been proved up to the hilt, though he does not, I think, know the proofs. For, though well-read, he has, on the ships themselves, missed the modern work which matters; the result, as regards the trireme (why call it 'triere'?), is peculiar. He holds himself bound by the 'evidence' (i.e. by the antiquated writers he lists) to believe in three superposed banks; but, like all other practical seamen, he would obviously reject them if he could. He therefore takes refuge in Admiral Serre's counsel of despair—three banks on parade, one only in action—and the book proceeds as though no banks were there; he has a number of correct statements quite inconsistent with them. If only he had happened upon (say) *The Mariner's Mirror* for 1933 he would have got a line upon what has been done, and would have seen that the 'evidence' which so hampers him has no existence: the thing is only a theory which grew out of a philological blunder and became hard-set by much repetition because no first-class scholar ever looked into it. Also he would not have made the length-breadth ratio of an ancient galley somewhere near 8 : 1 in face of the docks at Athens (6 : 1) and the dock at Delos (5½ : 1), or made the outrigger come in with the quinquereme when Assmann proved it long ago for the triremes of the Peloponnesian War. But, even thus handicapped, he has gone near to understanding the great ships; I think he would have accepted my explanation, for he has guessed two of its bases—that ten men to an oar was the maximum, and that the sixteen

was named from a pair of oars *both* rowed through the outrigger (see his cross-section).

It is a good book, but could have been better; it was bad luck that he should have missed just the things he

needed over the trireme business, and should thus have helped to perpetuate a baseless absurdity.

W. W. TARN.

*Muirtown, Inverness.*

### ANIMALS FOR SHOW AND PLEASURE.

George JENNISON, M.A., F.Z.S.: *Animals for Show and Pleasure in Ancient Rome.* Pp. xiv + 210; 10 figures. Manchester: University Press, 1937. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

MR JENNISON has found a fine subject ready to his hand and has written a very interesting and useful book. No man in England knows more about wild beasts in captivity than he does, or can better understand the vast ancient circuses and shows. He tells us (among many greater and lesser things) that traps and cages, modes of capture and conveyance, have hardly altered in two thousand years, and that more elaborate constructions would not work so well.

Greece, with her cock-fights and quail-fights, her doves and her peacocks, is soon done with; it was a great thing for her when a girl-goddess at a feast of Artemis had a team of stags to her chariot, and her Thessalian bull-fights were mere rustic displays of cowboy skill. Ptolemy the Second's great show at Alexandria, of which we read in Athenaeus, begins another story. It was a pageant of Dionysos, and was (as I imagine) doubtless full of religious symbolism, of which we know very little; but we know that the Morning Star rose at the beginning of it, and the Evening Star was depicted at its close. A hundred elephants drew the chariots; there were camels and wild asses, antelopes and ostriches, all in harness; the lions were the biggest ever; there were hounds and sheep and oxen of every sort and kind; there were even a giraffe and a rhinoceros, both from Ethiopia. It would take a hundred acres, says Mr Jennison, to accommodate this great collection, and it could be bought for about £45,000 at the

market prices of today. The great Roman shows, from Caesar's onwards, make up the bulk of the book; towards the end we learn from Claudian how Stilicho searched all Europe and North Africa for wild beasts to celebrate his consulate; and from Symmachus how he got his crocodiles from Egypt, his wolfhounds from Ireland, his horses from Spain, and the rest of his menagerie from here, there and everywhere.

Mr Jennison has drawn freely, and with full acknowledgment, on Loisel's *Histoire des Ménageries*. His book is less elaborate than Loisel's, and less learned than Otto Keller's *Antike Tierwelt*; but it will be useful to many a scholar, and sufficient for most readers' needs. The general plan is excellent; the accounts of the arena, the stockyards, the capture of the animals, are particularly instructive. But I should part company with him every here and there in identifying the less familiar beasts and birds. When he suggests that the little *πάνθηρ*, coupled by Oppian with the *αιλουροί*, was a Spotted Genet, I agree willingly. But I do not believe for a moment that *κίγκλος* was a dabchick, or *μαλακοκρανεύς* an ortolan, or Pliny's *novae aves* Hungarian partridges; nor that the gold-digging ants were pangolins; still less (if possible) that Oppian's *φώκη θλούσηρή* was a walrus; or that the old rustic in Calpurnius, who had had three weeks' holiday in Rome, had actually seen a polar bear killing seals in the Circus.

The printers have done a first-class job, and I have not noticed a single misprint—for *galinule* seems to be so spelled intentionally.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

*University of St. Andrews.*

## A CEMETERY AT NIJMEGEN.

H. BRUNSTING: *Het Grafveld onder Hees bij Nijmegen. Een Bijdrage tot de Kennis van Ulpia Noviomagus.* Pp. viii + 216; 12 plates. (Allard Pierson Stichting, Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen, IV.) Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Mij., 1937. Cloth.

NIJMEGEN is one of those sites which justify the labours of archaeologists. A legionary fortress was established here after the fatal year A.D. 70, and the remaining inhabitants of the destroyed Batavian oppidum alongside migrated to found a new settlement, Noviomagus (later Ulpia Noviomagus), on lower ground along the Waal, a mile or so to the west. In addition to these sites a number of important cemeteries have been located (cf. *C.R.* XLVII, 89). The one here described belonged to Ulpia Noviomagus, and hence is of great importance in reflecting the life of Roman Nijmegen at its most prosperous period. The bulk of the material lies in the Kam Museum at Nijmegen. Much of it was obtained during extensive but inadequately recorded excavations in 1905-9; building operations have yielded other finds, and Dr. Brunsting himself was able to excavate on a small scale in order to verify special points and to obtain additional fully noted burials. The burials are cremations, and the commonest grave-goods are pottery-vessels; other finds include a fair number of lamps (chiefly the 'firm' type), glass vessels, occasional clay figurines (including Italian imports), and small metal objects, including coins. There are a few mirrors, among them a British import of the

late first century A.D. (see *Arch. Journ.* LXXXV, 69-79).

The greater part of the volume is devoted to an exhaustive and carefully illustrated account of the pottery. This includes a long and important series of terra sigillata, imported from all the chief centres of manufacture. In the later period of the cemetery Lavoye ware is frequent, presumably indicating trade activity along the Meuse. Various other types of provincial pottery, familiar from Rhenish sites, are abundant. There is in addition the cruder German pottery ascribed to the Batavian elements in the population. This belongs to the end of the first century and disappears with the growing Romanization of the inhabitants.

The cemetery as a whole undoubtedly belongs to the period between A.D. 70 and the mid third century, when Noviomagus suffered heavily in the invasions. The author gives his general conclusions in German (pp. 198-211), and discusses the common occurrence of Celtic names and deities in this predominantly German corner of the Roman Empire. He notes that the Batavian remnant which settled along the Waal gave their new town the distinctively Celtic name Noviomagus, and he points out the frequency of Celtic names in graffiti from the cemetery. He concludes that the Batavi must have been subject to Celtic influences for a long period before they moved to the lower Rhine, and he ascribes this to the survival of strong Celtic elements in the land north of the middle Rhine occupied by the parent tribe, the Chatti.

O. BROGAN.

## SOME CLASS-BOOKS.

1. W. H. THOMPSON, H. L. TRACY, R. A. DUGIT: *Essential Latin.* Pp. xvii + 514; illustrations. London: Harrap, 1937. Cloth, 4s. 6d.
2. H. W. F. FRANKLIN and J. A. G. BRUCE: *Latin Prose Composition.* Pp. xii + 348; x + 124. London: Longmans, 1937. Cloth, 4s. 6d. and 2s. 9d.
3. H. G. FORD: *Hints on Latin Acci-* dence and Syntax. Pp. ix + 54. London: Methuen, 1937. Linen, 1s. 3d.
4. W. G. BUTLER: *One Hundred Latin Passages.* Pp. viii + 159. London: Methuen, 1937. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
5. C. F. C. LETTS: *The Eruption of Vesuvius.* Pp. viii + 72; one illustration. Cambridge: University Press, 1937. Cloth, 2s.

6. T. HORN: *Eighteen Roman Letters*. Pp. 128; illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937. Cloth, 2s.

7. W. H. OLDAKER: *Martial, Selected Easy Epigrams*. Pp. 105. London: Hopkinson, 1937. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

In theory the only justification for a new Latin Primer is that it can show either in matter or in form some feature to differentiate it from its many predecessors. In matter there is seldom much to glean: and even when there is, the author rarely takes his chance of emending the wrong old rule by corrections such as those which have lately been appearing in a good series of notes in 'Greece and Rome' on Heresies in Latin Grammar. The novelty must be looked for in the arrangement of familiar matter.

*Essential Latin* proceeds on the principle that interest must be aroused from the very beginning. Hence we have the earliest exercises on nouns and verbs interspersed with photographs of modern Italy, Latin mottoes, and texts from the Vulgate in capital letters. A serial story called Marcus and Virginia runs through the book in Latin which is very simple but is marred by elementary mistakes.

Messrs. Bruce and Franklin recognize that the beginner must tackle the bare bones, but they believe that the bones can be made more appetizing by some infusion of humanity and humour into the exercises. This is a legitimate idea and is well carried out. The continuous pieces are well chosen, and the sentences are lively, but some are surely too colloquial to be turned literally into anything that could be called Latin—e.g. 'The defendant may swear till he is blue in the face'. And what would a Roman make of the best possible translation of this: 'If ever a ball went past

his legs, he would hit it to the boundary of the field'?

Mr. Ford's book is a list of pitfalls for the unwary beginner in Latin grammar. It is inevitably a book of 'shreds and patches', of tricks and traps and catches: but none the less useful for that.

The four remaining books are Latin Readers, which all alike aim at increasing the interest of elementary Latin by including authors less military than Caesar and less hackneyed than Ovid. Mr. Butler makes a careful choice from Cicero, Sallust, Tacitus, Martial and others, as well as from the more familiar Nepos. He will earn the gratitude of all classical teachers, except those who have to find suitable extracts for Scholarship Latin Unseens! Mr. Letts's pieces are taken wholly from Pliny's famous letter about the eruption of Vesuvius. The book is supplied with useful Test Papers, and is interesting to read, though it would present a beginner with a formidable number of rare words.

Mr. Horn makes a collection of Latin letters, all of which could be read by boys in their third or fourth year of Latin. The introduction and notes are good.

Mr. Oldaker's little book is the most attractive of the batch. Who would have thought that so many of Martial's epigrams were within the reach of School Certificate candidates? This is a book to be recommended for reading, say, one hour a week with a Middle School form. The notes give just the help required. Is it fair to say of the Roman that 'an unprintable grossness was the chief thing that appeared to him as funny'?

J. T. CHRISTIE.

Westminster School.

#### STUDIES IN JUVENAL.

P. ERCOLE: *Studi Giovenaliani*. Pp. 355. Lanciano: Carabba, 1935. Paper, L. 15.

THIS disappointing work is a collection of seven essays written by an inspector of schools—bye-products of his unpublished translation of Juvenal—and ex-

tremely badly edited after his death by Mr Ettore Paratore. Ercole's mind was capacious but not acute; he made many mistakes, formal and substantial, which his editor has not removed; he was a poor arguer; and he dealt with only four of the satires separately: so

his book summarizes, but does not augment, the work which has been done on Juvenal.

From this general criticism I would except his studies of Juvenal's style, the short passage (264-72) on the vocabulary of XVI, and the essay on II and VI. The last thirty pages of chapter II contain an admirable and fully documented analysis of Juvenal's poetic achievement: his tragic dignity, his humour, his pessimism, his realism, and his occasional sentimentality are sympathetically described, and exemplified by full lists of the relevant passages. This is followed by lists of his grecisms, neologisms, and diminutives, by a very sane analysis of the rhetorical quality in his poems, and by a short but interesting paragraph on his metre. These pages are illuminating, and largely new. In the fourth essay, Ercole points out two facts which have never been emphasized: that II and VI are complementary pictures of male and female degeneracy, with several parallelisms of phrase and intention; and that both poems, though they seem to be universal in scope, are really attacks on the vicious life of the *rich*. They are therefore two more examples of Juvenal's habit of condemning all mankind and then hurling his fire on only one class in one abominable city. It is one of the satirist's finest tricks, for it assures both attention and sympathy: its most notable example is the elaborately universal programme of I 81-86, immediately succeeded and falsified by an attack on the greed and extravagance of contemporary Romans.

The first hundred pages of the book, devoted to a dangerously misleading account of Juvenal's career, culminate in a chronological scheme for the satires which is based on accepted facts, mis-translations, and groundless hypotheses, in roughly equal proportions. *Mistranslations*: Ercole translates (67) *Lamiarum caede madenti* of IV 154 by 'still dripping with the blood of the Lamiae' and interprets it to prove that IV was written immediately after Domitian's death. He believes (30) that *et melius nos egimus* of VII 124-5 means 'I, Juvenal, was long ago a better advocate', and (229) that *bibit* of I 49 is a perfect

He imagines (25) that *Martial XII, 18, 1-2*, combined with *facunde* of *Martial VII, 91, 1*—which Martial uses of poets and prosaists alike—presents a picture of Juvenal wandering through the Subura as a needy lawyer in search of a case. And he takes (35) *Paridem pantomimum poetamque eius* of the P biography to mean 'an actor and author named Paris'. *Fabrications*: Ercole asserts (61) that satire I, because it is the programme of book I, must have been written after II, III, IV, and V, so that (68) *ecce iterum Crispinus* of IV 1 cannot refer to the attack in I; and (71-77) that Juvenal describes the newsmonger's calamities of VI 407-11 in A.D. 110, before the similar calamities of A.D. 115-6, so that satire VI was finished *not later than A.D. 111*; and (55) that Juvenal was not rich in youth, although (20) he may have been *duo viri quinquennalis* of Aquinum—two mutually exclusive statements; and finally (35, 45, 50) that *nouis scriptis* of the P biography must mean VII, which is unnecessary if not impossible. Larger and more dangerous assumptions are (61) that a given satire was written and published one or two years after the latest chronological allusion in it, and (66, 102) that II-XVI succeed one another in order of composition. This contradicts what we know of the practice of other authors, and is a shaky foundation for any account of Juvenal's career. And Ercole's constant identification of the date of composition with the date of publication is destroyed by what we know both of the practice of recitation and of the division of the satires into books. Publication, for Juvenal, must mean publication in one *libellus* of 700 odd lines: that is the only reliable terminus, before which all chronological data are fluid.

To the question of Juvenal's exile Ercole brings no satisfactory solution. Ignoring the facts (which he elsewhere emphasizes) that Juvenal's hatred is focussed on Domitian and his age, and that his work weakens as it leaves that age behind, he constructs an elaborate time-scheme which arbitrarily allows a seven-year interval (A.D. 120-7) during which Juvenal was exiled by Hadrian to an Egyptian oasis (this from XV 33

II, 18, Martial  
of poets  
picture  
in the  
Arch of  
Pan-  
P bio-  
author  
Ercole  
it is  
have  
and V,  
of in I;  
es the  
07-11  
mities  
I was  
; and  
youth,  
luouir  
tually  
y (35,  
he P  
is un-  
er and  
e (61)  
/ pub-  
latest  
1 (66,  
other  
contra-  
ce of  
undar-  
career.  
on of  
date  
at we  
ation  
into  
must  
f 700  
ermit-  
data

exile  
ation.  
where  
ed is  
, and  
that  
corate  
ows a  
uring  
adrian  
V 33

and 46!) and then recalled 'as sufficiently punished' or 'through the intercession of some powerful friend' (47). His technique of assuming improbabilities and then referring to them as facts—'come già si disse'—makes it necessary to examine all his historical statements with the greatest care. I have no space to discuss his work on the MS tradition, but it seems to me to add little to recent studies, except a brief examination of ten *o* MSS.

A word on the editing. Mr Paratore has made no indices for the book, which is almost useless without them. He has neglected to insert the full cross-references which are indispensable in a closely argued treatise; the simple footnote 'v. Cap. II' is not only vain but annoying when chapter II is over a hundred pages long. He has allowed Ercole's textual errors (*Sauromatos* in II 1, p. 40, *multo sufflamine consul* in VIII 148, p. 90, *sportulat* in XIII 33,

p. 58) to stand uncorrected. He has read his proofs with gross carelessness: poor Mr Winstedt is always called Windstedt, and once (260) E. G. Windstedt; Heiric of Auxerre is usually named either Heinrich or Enrico; there are nine misprints on p. 230, five of them in a transcription of Housman's Latin note on 0 6; Leo's article on *Doppelassungen* and Dürr's biography are often misnamed; and there are false references on pp. 17—where Ercole has miscopied a note on page 3 of Geno-  
vese's *Giovenale*—80, 208, 229, and 274.

In fact, this is an uneven book, with some shockingly bad reasoning and some valuable literary criticism in it. It could have been made less dangerous by proper editing, but in its present state it cannot be used without an amount of care disproportionate to its value.

GILBERT HIGHET.

*Columbia University, New York.*

#### CHRISTIANS, JEWS AND PAGANS, ANCIENT AND MEDIAEVAL.

Robert F. CASEY, Silva LAKE and Agnes K. LAKE. *Quantulacumque: Studies presented to Kirsopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends.* Pp. viii + 367, 21 plates. London: Christophers, 1937. Cloth, 21s.

THIS is an impossible book to review adequately, for it contains articles dealing with all the subjects in which its honoured recipient takes an interest, and these are legion. Obviously, to deal with *A Political Treatise of the early French Renaissance* (J. M. Potter, pp. 9-22), *The Tertia Philosophia of Guillaume de Conches* (Th. Silverstein, 23-33), *Reflections on a Synagogue Inscription* (B. D. Erdmans, 35-40), *The Early Muslim Sects* (W. Thomson, 71-86), *Crisis in Ezekiel Research* (G. Dahl, 265-284), J. de Zwaan's theories of *The Edessene Origin of the Odes of Solomon* (285-301), R. H. Pfeiffer on *Midrash in the Books of Samuel* (303-16) or *Georgian and Armenian Gospels* (R. P. Blake, 355-63) would hardly come within the compass of this journal, even if the reviewer were not blankly ignorant of most of the subjects handled. Nearer the scope of a classical periodical are a series of essays on problems of New

Testament criticism. Several of these (*Rebuttal, a submerged Motive in the Gospels*, H. J. Cadbury, 99-108; *Some Remarks on Formgeschichtliche Methode*, R. P. Casey, 109-16; *The Date of Peter's Confession*, M. S. Enslin, 117-22; *The Sources of Mark*, N. Huffman, 123-9) are interesting chiefly as illustrating the extent to which subjectivity, of a kind reminiscent of a Homeric criticism now moribund, still governs those who play the pleasing game of guessing what the story of the Gospels was like before those venerable documents were written. One ingenious contributor, H. Pernot (*Que vaut notre texte des Évangiles?* 173-82) is of opinion that the text of the great uncials, and therefore of the standard modern editions, is very bad, owing to early editing and harmonizing. T. S. R. Broughton (131-8) studies three of the many problems concerning the journeys of St. Paul, and Suzanne Halstead (139-43) explains what the Athenian agora must have looked like when he visited it. There is no space to do more than mention the solid contributions to textual material of Sir F. G. Kenyon (145-8), B. H. Streeter (149-50), H. A. Sanders (151-61), C. H.

Kraeling (163-72), E. C. Colwell (183-8), C. Höeg and G. Zuntz (189-226), E. A. Lowe (325-31), W. P. Hatch (333-8) and Professor Souter (349-54). They all have to tell of MSS. hitherto unknown, misdated, imperfectly studied or ill classified. The origins of Christian architecture are treated briefly but with understanding by L. H. Vincent, O.P. (55-70). H.-G. Opitz (41-53) explains, with careful citation of the fragmentary authorities, what little is known of the obscure theological dispute in which Dionysios, Bishop of Alexandria, was engaged about 260 A.D. J. Wach (87-97) has chosen an interesting theme, *Der Begriff des Klassischen in der Religionswissenschaft*. Professor Goodenough (227-41), in defending his views concerning the Philonian use of 'mystery', seems to the reviewer to prove chiefly that the word means one thing for him and another for his critics. C. H. Torrey (317-24) has some excellent remarks on the stages by which *χριστός* passed into a proper name. H.

Lietzmann (339-48) produces from the University Library of Berlin a stray leaf of an otherwise unknown chronicle, running from 251 to 338 A.D., with many gaps. Silva Lake (365-7) adds to our scanty knowledge of Greek cryptograms.

The most interesting essays, to the present reviewer, are three which deal with the pagan religions of antiquity. Campbell Bonner (1-8) has some valuable ideas on the story of the Sibyl hanging in a bottle (Petronius 48 and elsewhere). Agnes K. Lake (243-51) produces solid reasons for supposing that a *supplicatio* is a purely Roman rite and a *puluinar* not necessarily a Greek couch for Greek images of gods or their emblems to lie upon. Professor L. R. Taylor (253-64) re-examines part of the Parthenon frieze, and argues well that the so-called peplos is a folded garment which is to be laid on a seat for one of the gods to sit on, in other words part of the preparations for a *sellisternium*.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

#### TOWN AND RULER IN HELLENISTIC TIMES.

Alfred HEUSS: *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus*. (Klio, Beiheft XXXIX.) Pp. xi + 273. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1937. Paper, M. 19.25 (bound, 21).

THIS is an interesting book, crammed with matter. Mr. Heuss has two aims: to find the juristic basis, if any, of the relationship between the Hellenistic king and the Greek city, and to combat the view of some scholars in Germany that the cities were part of the kingdom and only possessed municipal autonomy, which would mean that their position was much what it was under the Roman Empire. He first collects the facts under their different aspects and then examines the bearing of them; his conclusions, which are certainly correct, are that the relationship had no juristic basis at all but merely grew out of need and circumstance, and that the city was always a separate *state*; its sphere and that of the king crossed, but no new state-form was created.

So far so good. It is when we come to details that numerous questions arise; but to criticize the book in detail would demand an essay. His

argument against the belief that what gave the king a footing in the city was his divinity is striking, and may well be right (except for Alexander); but his own explanation can only apply to certain cases, and offers no alternative principle. The section on king and league is good; but he would have seen the League of Corinth a little differently had he realized that Philip was two separate things, not only the elected President but also the Macedonian State. The chapter on proclamations of freedom is excellent; but here again, in his desire to negative the belief that there could be both free and 'unfree' cities within the same king's sphere, he has overlooked that under the same king (Seleucus IV) the Assembly at Seleuceia in Pieria was controlled while that at Antioch in Persis was not. He gets rid of these controlled Assemblies too lightly; in fact his treatment of the *epistates* seems to me hardly adequate, and the Babylonian *epistates* at Orchoi is merely omitted, just as, when he makes the royal *diagramma* apply only to single cities, he neglects to discuss

the bearing on this of the Seleucid rescript known in 218 B.C. on the law concerning *παρακαταθήκη*. Similarly, garrisons and taxation (where Seleuceia on the Tigris only gets a most imperfect note) are treated too cavalierly; doubtless they had no juristic import, but they were the things which mattered in the eyes of the cities. Omitting mere mistakes (as that Lysimachus is the only king known to have arbitrated between Greek cities, or that the gymnasium at Halicarnassus named Philippeion must have been built by some Ptolemy), the weak point in the book, to me, is that the author, in his anxiety to establish his conclusions, explains away too much, sometimes most unconvincingly, as in his treatment of the plain statement of Antigonus I at the synoecism of Lebedus and Teos that he would punish anyone who proposed a

law of which he disapproved. Now most interferences with the constitution —this of Antigonus I, the controlled Assemblies, the appointment by the Attalids of city magistrates at Pergamum—took place in new foundations; suppose he had enquired whether (as he assumes) the position of a new city was necessarily the same in every respect as that of an old one? Even so, one great obstacle would remain, the remodelling of Cyrene's constitution by Ptolemy I; and here he can only suggest that Ptolemy may not have been the author of the famous *diagramma*. It is a useful book, and well worth reading; but it would have been a stronger one had he more frankly admitted that some kings sometimes encroached very considerably on the city-state.

W. W. TARN.

Muirtown, Inverness.

A. MINARD : *Deux relatifs homériques*. Pp. 96. (Extrait de la Revue de Philologie, Tome XI.) Paris : Klincksieck, 1937. Paper. This study of *ōs ris* and *ōs re* is a careful piece of work, showing considerable subtlety of thought and a thorough knowledge of modern grammarians. While dealing primarily with Homer, it also takes some account of later writers.

The significance of *ōs ris* is relatively speaking clear, though M. Minard contributes much to tracing the connection between its various usages. *ōs re* presents a far thornier problem. Admittedly it often has a generalizing force. The easiest explanation, and perhaps after all the right one, of the places in which no generalizing force can be found is that in such cases *re* has become stereotyped, and has lost its original significance. Minard rejects this view, and seeks to find a common parent of all senses of *ōs re* in the idea of 'indétermination temporelle', 'des fois', 'à l'occasion', 'il se pourra'. This bifurcates into 'liaison contingente' and 'liaison stable'. The examples falling under the first of these heads lack, as Minard admits, the 'netteté' of those falling under the second. They are, in fact, disturbingly heterogeneous. One subdivision is 'arbitraire' (e.g.  $\psi$  11, 'à leur gré': here, incidentally, *ōs re* might be taken as marking 'liaison stable', and the same applies to some of the other examples of 'liaison contingente'). Another is 'identification' (e.g.  $\chi$  114, 'précisément'). The primary concept of 'liaison contingente', from which such very different usages are said to be derived, seems really almost too nebulous to be recognized as a concept at all. Minard has made a gallant attempt to collect the stragglers into orderly columns. Even if we remain unconvinced (particularly in view of other uses of Epic *re* which lie outside Minard's

scope) we must nevertheless welcome this book as a serious contribution to linguistic studies.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

Wilko de Boer : *Galeni de proprietum animi cuiuslibet affectuum dignotione et curatione / de animi cuiuslibet peccatorum dignotione et curatione / de atra bila*. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum V, 4, I. I.) Pp. xvi + 166. Leipzig : Teubner, 1937. Export prices: paper, RM. 8.55; bound, 10.05.

In his preface to the two treatises *de proprietum animi cuiuslibet affectuum dignotione et curatione* and *de animi cuiuslibet peccatorum dignotione et curatione* de Boer recapitulates and supplements his previous dissertation on the same subject (1911), and includes a useful conspectus of the MSS and the various editions and Latin versions, and of other works dealing with the treatises, sometimes together with a succinct estimate of their value. The first serious attempt to produce a really critical text was made by Marquardt (1884), whose edition marks a great advance on any previous work, but is, no doubt justly, though somewhat insistently, reprimanded by de Boer, who for this edition has had the aid of new collations and photographs. A larger field of MSS (fourteen in number) of the *de atra bila* attests its popularity in the Middle Ages, and as de Boer has already written about these MSS too, he here gives a summary of his previous account, though he includes a collection of passages to illustrate their relationship. This represents the first really independent edition of the *de atra bila* since that of Chartier (1679), which Kuehn (1823) merely followed.

It is gratifying that the author has now been able to bring to fruition his earlier work on these treatises. The text is supplied through-

out with a very full *apparatus*, as usual, and other useful references ; and there is an admirable index.

A. L. PECK.

*Christ's College, Cambridge.*

*Josephus : Jewish Antiquities. Books IX-XI.*

With an English translation by Ralph MARCUS. Pp. xi + 532. (Loeb Classical Library.) London : Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THIS volume worthily continues the excellent translation of the *Antiquities* of which former instalments have been noticed in *C.R.* It has the merits of its predecessors, an accurate and readable English version and valuable critical and explanatory notes, with full references which enable the reader easily to follow the smallest variations from the Old Testament. Book XI, the Achaemenids and Alexander, contains matter of considerable interest, which is well treated. A good case is made (p. 469) for the real name of 'Batis', who held Gaza against Alexander, being Bagamisa, 'Mithras is God', which would presumably make him a Persian—yet one more reason for believing that the Hegesias-Curtius story of Alexander's atrocious treatment of the 'negro' Batis is untrue, especially as an early Rabbinical source (p. 519) makes the Jews treat some Samaritans in exactly the same extraordinary way. An Appendix, B, examines Josephus' date, c. 330, for the Samaritan schism, and decides that it was really c. 430 and that Josephus is not historical. Whatever Josephus' source, its object was certainly to bring in Alexander ; it is a small parallel to Alexander's famous 'visit to Jerusalem'. This is most carefully examined in Appendix C, and Dr. Marcus pronounces against it, though not too decisively. He need not have been so cautious. The story is one of a class which seeks to connect a people or an individual with some well-known personage, as when Pseudo-Aristeas makes Ptolemy II a great friend of the Jews ; and just as Pseudo-Aristeas works in a third-century document, so Alexandria may have invented the visit to Jerusalem fairly early. Another instance is the continuing manufacture of stories which ultimately brought Diogenes the Cynic into relation not only with Alexander but with very many other prominent persons. A discussion of Josephus' sources for the Hellenistic and Roman periods is promised in the final volume.

W. W. TARN.

*Muirtown, Inverness.*

*Campbell BONNER : The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek. (Studies and Documents, VIII.) Pp. x + 106 ; 2 facsimiles of the papyrus. London : Christophers, 1937. Sewed, 15s.*

IN 1931 Sir Frederic Kenyon announced that a substantial portion of the lost Greek text of the Book of Enoch was included in the Chester Beatty papyri. These Chester Beatty leaves, along with others in the possession of the University of Michigan, are now published by Professor Bonner. They form part of a papyrus codex of the fourth century which contained also a homily on the Passion by Melito of

Sardis. The homily is to be published later. The Greek text of Enoch runs from xvii. 6 to cvii. 3, and it appears from the page-numeration that the Codex originally contained Enoch xci-cvii. (Incidentally it confirms the suspicion that cv and cviii are not genuine.)

This first edition of the Greek text of these chapters is a valuable piece of work. There is an excellent introduction followed by a double presentation of the text. On the left-hand pages is given a diplomatic transcript of the papyrus, on the right an edited Greek text. The notes on the text are mostly concerned with textual problems, particularly the disagreements between the Greek and the Ethiopic version. There is also a translation of the Greek, and an index of Greek words. Of the two plates one (Pl. II) has already appeared in Kenyon's edition of the Chester Beatty Papyri (Fasc. I Pl. XII).

A comparison of the printed text with the facsimiles shows that the transcript may be relied upon. Errors are few and slight : p. 5 l. 24, the *v* of *νωι* should have the diaeresis ; l. 38, there seem to be clear traces of the second *ro* of [*στρυματο*]s ; p. 8. l. 13, *οταν*, the papyrus gives *οταν* (sic) ; l. 29, *ονκ*, papyrus *ονκ*. None of these affects the sense of the text.

Of the many points of interest raised by this text special attention may be drawn to the new lexicographical data collected by the editor (p. 20) : two new verbs, *λαργειν* and *ἀναφαρειν* ; and two new meanings, *προέχομαι* 'offer' (a petition) and *κόρων* 'the pupil of the eye'.

T. W. MANSON.

*University of Manchester.*

*E. H. BLAKENEY : The Praises of Wisdom. Being Part I of the Book of Wisdom. A Revised Translation with Notes. Pp. xii + 57. Oxford : Blackwell, 1937. Cloth, 7s. 6d.*

THE general reader will find this a pleasant book to handle and read : paper, printing, and binding are excellent. It contains a brief introduction, chapters i-ix and xi. 23-26 of the apocryphal *Wisdom of Solomon* (Greek text and English translation on opposite pages), notes, and a short glossary. The serious student will find it a drawback that the complete text of the work is not given.

The Greek text is based on Codex Vaticanus (B), which Mr Blakeney seldom deserts except to correct its spelling to classical standards. The translation is based on the Authorized Version, and, unfortunately, it does not always agree with the Greek text. For example, at ii. 8 the text has *ἀέρος* with B, but the translation implies A's reading *έαπος* ; ii. 9 text *ἡμῶν*—translation 'meadow' (= *λειμῶν*) ; v. 14 text *πάχη*—translation 'foam' (*ἀψύν*) ; ix. 16 text *ἐν χερού*—translation 'before us' (= *ἐν ποού*). In general the translation is easy and pleasant reading, though too free for any but general readers. Sometimes words or phrases of the Greek text are passed over in the translation, and sometimes the rendering is difficult to accept, e.g. 'frolics' as a translation of *θυμού* (vii. 20) or 'evils' for *τέλη* (iii. 19). In the translation of iv. 17 'not' is required before

later. 6 to  
Enoch  
picion  
these  
double  
hand  
of the  
text.  
cerned  
green-  
nomic  
of the  
of the  
ed in  
papyri  
in the  
ay be  
: p. 5  
esis :  
f the  
, the  
papyrus  
f the  
y this  
new  
ditor  
pav' ;  
r' (a  
ON.  
dom.  
. A  
xii +  
s. 6d.  
asant  
f in  
f the  
text  
(ges),  
udent  
ext of  
canus  
cept  
ards.  
rized  
ways  
e, at  
transla-  
—  
text  
text  
oviv').  
asant  
eral  
f the  
ation,  
t to  
quois  
the  
before

'understand', and in vii. 8 'wrath' is a misprint for 'wealth'. Something has gone wrong with the verse numeration at ii. 21, 22 and v. 1-6.

The notes are interesting and cover a wide range of literature both ancient and modern. They should be very useful to the general reader, and the serious student will find valuable material incorporated in them. They do not pretend to be a full commentary on the text; but they are a welcome supplement to existing works.

T. W. MANSON.

*University of Manchester.*

E. H. KASE, Jr.: *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*, Vol. II. Pp. xi+130; 10 collotype facsimiles. Princeton: University Press (London: Milford), 1936. Cloth. 14s.

THIS is the second volume of the series initiated by Johnson and Van Hoesen in 1931. Their volume consisted of a single series of texts from the same locality; the contents of the present one are miscellaneous. There are no examples of pagan literature, but two small, though interesting, fragments of a fifth-century codex of St. James's Epistle, a horoscope, an erotic charm, and an amulet against fever may be classed as literary or semi-literary. The Ptolemaic period is represented by four documents, only one of which, no. 16, is of much interest. This is mainly an explanation of a failure to appear in court. It is not certain that, as Kase assumes, the man concerned was a party to the suit; the phrase *τὴν ἐπιστολὴν* (not 'a letter' but 'the letter') suggests that he was the messenger who took the order to the *epistles* to summon one of the parties. If so, it is unnecessary to give to *ἀναδικῆσαι* a sense different from the usual; 'how', he asks in effect, 'could the party appear in court to put in his appeal when the notice was so short?'

The remaining texts are documents of the Roman and Byzantine periods. There are none of the first importance, but several are noteworthy and many minor points of interest arise. Only a few have appeared previously in periodicals. The editing is good, with adequate and acute, though not abundant, commentary, and the decipherments on the whole inspire confidence. Many of the papyri are however in bad condition, and several passages seem to call for revision. The facsimile of no. 37 shows that *τῶν* has fallen out of the transcript in l. 2 (before 'Αλεξανδρέων). At the end of the line *διὰ* rather than *διὰ* is suggested by the facsimile; and so too in l. 10 *συν(φωνῶ)* for *σεσηρ(ειοναι)* and in l. 12 *ἐνά[η]* for *ε*". But it is perhaps rash to correct from a facsimile readings made from the original.

H. I. BELL.

*British Museum.*

H. BOLKESTEIN: *ΞΕΝΟΝ*: Gastverblijf, Pelgrimsherberg, Arnhuis (=Mededeelingen d. K. Akademie v. Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Deel 84, Serie B, No. 3.) Pp. 40. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers - Maatschappij, 1937. Paper, fl. 0.80.

THE object of this well-informed and well-reasoned monograph is to determine why those Christian institutions for the relief of the poor and sick, variously known as *πτωχεία*, *νοσοκομεία* and by other descriptive names of like sort, were also called *ξενοδοχεία* (the word survives today in the sense of 'hotel') or, more classically, *ξεώνες*. Incidentally it enquires to what extent they were characteristically Christian and not inherited from earlier times. They can hardly be the descendants of the hospitals for slaves on *latifundia* and soldiers on active service, *ualetdinaria*, nor yet of *λαρπία*, which were the consulting-rooms or nursing-homes of private doctors. The classical meaning of *ξεών* is of course an apartment or separate building for the accommodation of visitors, whether to a private house, a city or a shrine. He would seek the connection in the East, where the idea that a god particularly favours and protects the poor is at home. Consequently, many eastern gods, including Yahweh at Jerusalem, were kind to and made provision for poor pilgrims to their shrines, and temples with *ξεώνες* attached were no rarity. Christian emphasis on the duty of providing for the poor as such (not simply for poor citizens as citizens) together with the disastrous economic conditions of the third and succeeding centuries would go a great way towards accounting for the change, and it may very well be that many Christian *ξενοδοχεία* were originally the *ξεώνες* of temples pressed into the service of the new state.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

NINO SALANITRO: *L'Epodo secondo di Orazio*. Pp. 14. Catania: Casa Editrice 'La Vittoria', 1935. Paper, 4s. 6d.

HORACE'S Second Epode has puzzled many who rightly refuse to disregard the last four lines. A long and ostensibly sincere eulogy of country life ends in a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* (l. 67): the speaker is a well-known usurer, Alcifus; he calls in all his money on the Ides to realize his dream; on the Kalends—he lends it out again. Mr. Salanitro objects to the usurer's being the speaker, because in his mouth the eulogy would be a travesty (p. 7); and he will not allow that Horace is being satirical, because this picture of country life represents exactly his own ideal, as we know from elsewhere.

His solution is that Horace is himself the speaker. With *haec ubi locutus* in 67 he then understands sum and a comma. Some did this before Lambinus, but is it possible even syntactically? And when he goes on to explain *quarerit Kalendis ponere* by 'in praediis emendis' he destroys the delightfully Horatian *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, which is pointed by the *iam iam* two lines before.

But he is on the right track when he asks on page 8 why Horace, if his whole object was to satirize Alcifus' insincerity, extended his eulogy to 66 lines, and when he insists on p. 7 that the close has a limited importance both in the interpretation and in the evaluation of the poem. Surely the general effect is of a sincere *μακάρως* with a touch of satire at the end aimed, not at country life itself (Tyrrell's misappre-

hension), but at its insincere eulogists. If this is unacceptable, the orthodox view must stand, that the whole is a satire on such conventional eulogies.

L. P. WILKINSON.

*King's College, Cambridge.*

*The Gellius Manuscript of Lupus of Ferrières.*

By Sister Luanne MEAGHER, O.S.B. Pp. iv+96; 2 plates. Private Edition, Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, 1936. Paper.

THE importance of the part played in the transmission of Latin classics by Servatius Lupus, the ninth-century abbot of Ferrières, has been better known since the publication by Beeson of a facsimile of the Harleian MS. of Cicero's *De Oratore* in his autograph (C.R. XLV, 1931, p. 45), and by Laistner and Lowe of lists of the MSS in which his characteristic annotations are to be found. The present dissertation (reproduced in excellent *Maschinenhandschrift*), by a Chicago pupil of Beeson, is devoted to an exhaustive study of the ninth-century Vatican Aulus Gellius (Reginensis 597), corrected and annotated in Lupus's hand throughout. His work in correcting and emending the text is laboriously collected and analysed, giving reality to what we are told in handbooks of the activity of the Carolingian scholars. Besides this, the habit of writing a word in the margin of his books against any passage that appealed to him makes it possible to see what interest the classics had for such a man—not so very unlike our own; he marks apt phrases, rare words or points of syntax, and sections interesting for their subject-matter. There are two reduced, but useful, facsimiles from the MS. Sister Luanne has added a discussion of the work of the original scribes of the book, and a list of corrections where its readings have been wrongly reported by Hertz and Hosius. Her industrious accumulation of details is not, and could not be, easy reading; but it will have to be read by any serious student of this most influential epoch in the history of our Latin texts.

R. A. B. MYNORS.

*Balliol College, Oxford.*

Bertil AXELSON: *Ein drittes Werk des Firmicus Maternus? Zur Kritik der philologischen Identifizierungsmethode.* Pp. 26. (K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse 1936-1937, IV.) Lund: Gleerup, 1937. Paper.

BUT for this devastating attack, Dom Morin's assertion that Firmicus Maternus was the author of the *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* might have held the field. Like the present reviewer, some scholars will have noticed that certain features of the language (e.g. *credo intellegas* p. 35, 35; *credo teneas* p. 78, 11) speak against the thesis, but would not on such evidence have contradicted the authority of the great Benedictine patrologist. Now Axelson has taken up and settled the question by pointing out (1) that Dom Morin's main argument, his list of parallel expressions in the *Consultationes* and in Firmicus—if it were more substantial—could prove only that the anonymous

author had read Firmicus; (2) that the *Klauseltechnik* of the two authors is widely at variance; and (3) that a great number of words, such as *absque, erga, haud, igitur, nequaquam, praecipue, quoniam, velut*, are used frequently in the *Consultationes*, whereas Firmicus avoids them.

Some good emendations on Morin's text of the *Consultationes* conclude the treatise, which is brilliantly written and, in addition to carrying its point successfully, contains various interesting suggestions.

OTTO SKUTSCH.

*St. Andrews.*

Dag NORBERG: *In Registrum Gregorii Magni studia critica.* (Uppsala Universitets Årskrift, 1937: 4.) Pp. xv+175. Uppsala: Lundequist, 1937. Paper, Kr. 6.

IN many passages of the *Registrum*, N. criticizes the text presented by Ewald and Hartmann in *M.G.H. Epist. I-II*. Some corruptions have been caused by mistaken resolution of sigla on the part of scribes (e.g. II. p. 8, 25, *ga* has given rise to a senseless *quam* instead of *qui appellatur*); or by wrong division (II p. 140, 13, *eisdem suscepti* should be *eis desuscepti*); or by the desire to eliminate the unfamiliar (I p. 272, 1, *assertit* for *inquit* with acc. and inf.). In some cases the editors have rejected the original spelling in favour of later corrections: and Hartmann made criticism more difficult by not including orthographical matters in his apparatus. But for the fortunate chance that *Epist. XIV* 14 was preserved in inscriptional form at the monastery to which it was directed, the spelling *hortus* (acc. pl.) would have been replaced by the reading of R 1 *hortos*. N. reasserts the point already made by Peitz that G.'s letters to subordinates are composed according to formulae like those in the *Liber Diurnus*, and that the phraseology of these formulae is modelled on that of imperial edicts and law codes. Consequently, in criticizing letters of this class one must go outside the normal usage of G. for illustration and comparison.

N. discusses all the points he raises with an enviable disregard of brevity: yet he scarcely ever fails to be interesting. Most of his emendations are certainly right and some are highly ingenious. I feel a qualm however about the ascription to G. of *-as* in the nom. pl. of the first declension. I am not convinced that outside place-names G. would use this form: certainly, to outweigh the probability of a mistake in transmission, we should require more than the three or four examples which N. gives us.

J. W. PIRIE.

*University of Glasgow.*

Arvid G. ELG: *In Faustum Reensem Studia.* Pp. xiv+156. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1937. Paper.

FOUR years' study of Faustus, Bishop of Rei, has enabled the author to criticize in some details the edition of Engelbrecht (1891) in *C.S.E.L. XXI*. He has subjected certain syntactical features to a closer scrutiny, making full use of recent investigations into Late Latin usage. He has examined also his author's rhythms and presents tables showing the actual

frequency of the various forms of *cursus* and also, after the style of de Groot, the percentages of relative frequency when comparison is made with non-rhythmic prose. For reasons of syntax or rhythm, as well as on more general grounds, he expresses a preference for various readings that Engelbrecht either rejected or neglected.

Elg's work is interesting, accurate and scholarly. It is true, I think, that occasionally in his eagerness to establish his own view he omits considerations that might tell against it. Thus, when he condemns Engelbrecht's emendation of the difficult passage at p. 193, 20, he does not point out that in addition to the parallel at p. 171, 15 there is another passage at 79, 14 which supports the proposed method of reconstruction. Faustus' mind runs in grooves, and the odds are great that, when he has twice expressed the same thought in very much the same way, a third instance will not show any marked difference. Again, he is concerned to show that F. uses impersonal *inquit* but not impersonal *dicit*. He searches hard to find the subject left unexpressed with *dicit*, and in every case finds it. If he searched as hard in the examples he quotes of *inquit*, one feels he would be equally successful. This applies even to the cases where, as he says, we should logically expect *inquit*, e.g. p. 151, 6 *Habitatorem cordis humani sacra eloquia proprie spiritum sanctum esse definunt: 'dabit', inquit, 'vobis pater alium paracletum'* (= Ioann. 14, 16, where the speaker is Christ). In only one of these examples (p. 168, 7) is it hard to supply a subject, and there we are dependent on S, which is notably careless in the matter of endings. These criticisms do not appreciably affect the high opinion I have formed of Elg's work.

J. W. PIRIE.

University of Glasgow.

*A Contemporary of Shakespeare on Phonetics and on the Pronunciation of English and Latin.* By H. G. FIEDLER. Pp. iv+21.

London : Milford, 1936. Paper, 3s.

PROFESSOR FIEDLER here gives us a study of *The Art of Pronunciation*, by Robert Robinson, published at London in 1617, of which a copy in the Bodleian Library appears to be the only one extant. Robinson's main interest was in phonetics, and an important item in his book is a phonetic transcript of a Latin poem from his own pen. Professor Fiedler reproduces this transcript in facsimile, and on another page has re-transcribed the symbols invented by Robinson into those commonly used to-day.

The editor remarks that Robinson's treatise 'gives us more accurate information about the conventional school pronunciation of Latin in Shakespeare's days than any other source at our disposal'. As one would expect, Robinson's pronunciation of Latin is the progenitor of what we now call the 'old' pronunciation. Thus, he shortens stressed vowels in closed syllables and lengthens them in open syllables (except when the stress is on the antepenultimate), pronounces *c* in such words as *licet*, and *sc* in *scit*, as [s], and pronounces *ae* and stressed long *e* alike. Wherever his pronunciation differs from the

'old' pronunciation, there is a corresponding difference between twentieth-century and Shakespearean English. For instance, he pronounces long *o* (*Roman*) as [ü] (cf. the pun in *Julius Caesar* : 'Now is it Rome indeed, and room enough'), and long *i* as [ei]—a pronunciation to which the 'refined' English of to-day has reverted.

Robinson's treatise provides a valuable link in the history of the pronunciation of Latin in England. It confirms what one concludes from the study of Medieval Latin documents and other evidence, i.e. that Latin in England (as elsewhere) was, throughout the Middle Ages and down to the recent dissemination of the reformed pronunciation in academical circles and of the Italian pronunciation in ecclesiastical circles, usually pronounced on the same principles as the vernacular. F. BRITAIN.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

Franz DORNSEIFF : *Der sogenannte Apollon von Olympia.* Pp. 18. (Greifswalder Beiträge zur Literatur- und Stilforschung, Beiheft 1.) Greifswald : Dallmeyer, 1936. Paper.

HERE are put forward a number of arguments, in themselves of some plausibility, to support Pausanias' identification of the central figure of the west pediment at Olympia as Peirithoos.

Answers of similar nature and equal validity can be readily found for the more serious of them ; and discussion is better limited to something more solid. Dornseiff says that the figure is in no way designated as Apollo. Can he have overlooked the fact that it was originally holding in its left hand two objects, and that those objects were evidently a bow and an arrow ? The hole into which the bow fitted is there—it reproduces almost perfectly the section of the stave ; the small drill-hole by which the bow-string was attached is there too ; and so is the cutting for the arrow. Now these objects can be considered either simply as weapons, or as distinguishing attributes, i.e. symbols of characteristic activity. If they are primarily distinguishing attributes, how does Peirithoos come to have those which are universally recognized as Apollo's ? If they are simply weapons, why is he not using them against the ravisher of his bride ? A public familiar with the conduct of Admetos, or of Theseus in Naxos, might have condoned the lack of a chivalry it never knew ; but not, surely, a lack of manhood. If Dornseiff can explain away this single objective point, we may find it possible to concede to his theory the admiration we now reserve for his exposition of it.

BERNARD ASHMOLE.

University College, London.

*Allard Pierson Museum* (Archaeologisch Museum der Universiteit van Amsterdam). Algemeene Gids. Pp. ix+239; 100 plates. Amsterdam : N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1937. Paper, f. 2.

THE Allard Pierson Museum was presented in 1934 to the city of Amsterdam by the Allard Pierson Foundation, which was responsible for the acquisition of certain important private collections to form its nucleus. It is primarily

the archaeological museum of the University of Amsterdam, but it is also arranged with a view to the interest of the general public. The curators lay no claim to the possession of world-famous individual pieces, but they hope to make the museum as representative as possible. Being a young museum, it has certain gaps, but it also has a number of special features, such as the unusually good collection of objects of the Greek and Roman periods from Egypt, and the collection of Coptic art. Pains have been taken to avoid making the Guide a mere list of the contents of cases and it has been carefully planned on a historical basis. The historical background of each main group of objects is given, with useful notes on the development and spread, through commercial and other influences, of the various arts and crafts. The Guide contains useful sections on Greek pottery and terracottas, on Greek, Etruscan and Roman bronzes, and, as might be expected, on the pottery of Roman Germany. Dr. G. A. S. Snijder and Heer L. J. Elferink are to be congratulated on the production of a very useful and richly illustrated student's handbook to ancient crafts. O. BROGAN.

Sir Aurel STEIN: *Archaeological Reconnaissances in North-Western India and South-Eastern Irān*. Pp. xx+267; 4 maps, 18 plans, 34 plates, and 88 illustrations in text. London: Macmillan, 1937. Cloth, £3 3s.

THIS splendidly produced volume primarily records the author's journey of exploration through Makran and Kerman in 1931-3. It was rich in discoveries of the chalcolithic period, but there is little for the classical student—a demonstration that Alexander passed through Jiruft, the identification of Ptolemy's *Tēuora* with Tiz, and some account of Old Hormuz (Harmozia), whence came the only Greek objects actually found, two late Hellenistic seals; but a study of Alexander's route through Gedrosia and Carmania is promised. The first chapter of the book, however, is devoted to Alexander's campaign in the Punjab. A topographical examination of the westward shift of the Beas shows that 'Alexander's altars' were long since washed away. This is new; the rest is an amplification of the author's article (*Geog. J.* LXXX, 1932, p. 32) on Alexander's passage of the Hydaspes—he camped at Haranpur and crossed at Jalalpur—to which is now added some very pertinent counter-criticism of Professor Breloer, the latest exponent of the rival 'Jhelum' theory. It is much the best working-out of the problem which exists; but the river-bend at the *ākpa*, to which Arrian (after Ptolemy) applies *λόγιον δίλος*, has been a trouble, for on the map it is very slight. Stein now says that the impression of the bend would be increased if it is seen from the riverine plain; but Ptolemy crossed the river. The study was apparently written away from books, and I imagine that the entirely erroneous translation and note on p. 110 of J. W. MacCrindle's *Invasion of India*<sup>2</sup>, 1896, are responsible for the erroneous citations from the Alexander-historians used to locate Bucephala at Jalalpur; it was certainly on the other (south-eastern) bank. I am deal-

ing with that elsewhere, and only mention it because, however brilliant the author's reconstruction may be, there can be no *certainty* till Bucephala be located and identified by excavation; and it is no good looking on the wrong bank. There are some mounds here on the south-eastern side; one, it is said, might from its height be old. W. W. TARN.

Muirtown, Inverness.

*The Marriage of Peleus and Thetis*. By A. K. CLARKE. Pp. 33. Cambridge: Heffer, 1937. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

*Persephone* and other Poems. By J. Slingsby ROBERTS. Pp. 96. Hove (Sussex): Cambridges, 1937. Grey board, 5s.

IT is pleasant to see that classical subjects can still inspire original verse, and these two volumes are interesting from the contrast they present. Both writers, as they have the right to do, deal freely with the myths involved; Miss Clarke, for instance, makes Thetis for the nonce a Titan and sister of Themis, and Mr. Roberts makes Persephone elect to reign in Hell rather than return to the Upper World, even periodically. Apart from this, however, their methods are quite different. Miss Clarke tells the story of Peleus and Thetis in rhymed stanzas ending with an Alexandrine, but two lines shorter than the Spenserian model. For the use of stanzas she apologizes in a preface, but her purpose justifies it, for she is not so much bent on telling a story, though she does so, as on evoking images and suggesting ideas. This she does with some success, and her pictures are pleasing.

The diction and rhythms are often reminiscent of Keats in most cases, and the style sometimes a little too elaborate for all tastes, as in the line: 'The smooth anemones in rubied silence brood.' They are sea anemones, I should explain. The proceeds from the book are to be given to the Newnham College Building Fund.

Mr. Roberts's methods are quite different. His style is more austere and his use of words exact, and the pictures he evokes stand out sharply. 'Persephone' is a striking poem both in form and substance. In 'Phaethon' he makes a bold attempt to give life to the story, and outbids Ovid in calling to life the constellations as monsters to beset the path. He writes vigorously and escapes absurdity, which in such a case is much, but Dante is the only poet since Aeschylus who could do such things quite convincingly. There are besides these longer poems two sonnets, one on the story of Menalippus and Comaetho, and one on Aeschylus. The latter is based on the theory, chronologically difficult, that Aeschylus in the *P.V.* despaired of the gods whom he earlier justified. A translation of the first chorus of the *Agamemnon* is vigorous and dignified and close to the original. Another, of the ode to Eros in the *Antigone*, is naturally less successful, for the ode defies translation. The rest of the poems are not classical in subject, but like those already considered they show technical skill and express genuine thoughts and feelings.

F. R. EARP.

A. GRAF: *Uebersicht der antiken Geographie von Pannonien*. (Dissertationes Pannonicæ ex Instituto . . . Universitatis . . . Budapestinensis, ser. I fasc. 5.) Pp. 156: folding map at end. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1936. Sewn, Pengö 15.

Its title might suggest that this book is a critical discussion of the early sources for the geography of Pannonia—something like the third book of John Horsley's *Britannia Romana*, with the text of each ancient writer forming the basis of a separate chapter. Such an arrangement makes easy reading, and that is not a disadvantage in a work of reference. Mr Graf has chosen a different method, and produced a gazetteer of the province, fully documented with references not merely to ancient writers but to modern research—so fully, and so objectively, that the general view which its title promises is at times hard to obtain. That is not altogether Mr Graf's fault. Few provinces of the Roman Empire can have received such intensive and well-directed attention as Pannonia has obtained in recent years, largely as a result of the stimulus given by Professor Alföldi and the university which sponsors the present publication; and the general view has a host of articles, written in half-a-dozen languages (not all familiar to most English readers), to take into account. Adequate indexes, and a map of welcome simplicity, combine to make the book invaluable as a quarry, for all its lack of form. Those who wish to know how much has been discovered about a particular site, or to place an inscription recorded in *L'Année Epigraphique* under an obscure modern name, may rest assured that it will save them an extended search; and it can be made to supply welcome information on wider questions, such as the tempo of the Roman advance to the Danube frontier, and the romanization of its hinterland.

Sometimes the symbols used on the map to distinguish sites of different types appear to be mischosen, and the placing of tribes and spelling of place-names do not always command confidence; one could wish, too, that the boundaries between Pannonia and neighbour-

ing provinces had been defined with as much care as that between Upper and Lower Pannonia; but these are minor points which do not really detract from the value of a first-rate work of reference.

ERIC BIRLEY.

*Hatfield College, Durham.*

Betty HEIMANN, Ph.D.: *Indian and Western Philosophy, a Study in Contrasts*. Pp. 156. London: Allen and Unwin, 1937. Cloth, 5s. net.

MISS HEIMANN, who is a Lecturer in Sanskrit at the London School of Oriental Studies, deals in sweeping generalizations. Indian philosophy is 'cosmic', Western philosophy is 'anthropological'. The *homo mensura* doctrine is the basis of all Western philosophy (except that of the Pre-Sophistics and that of Plato, 'the last great cosmic thinker of the West'), while Indian philosophy refuses to allow to man any pre-eminence over other things in the world. Plato retained a 'cosmic' outlook by applying to his principles the term *θεοπία*, while 'conversely' Aristotle, the 'first great Western philosopher', 'invented' the term *σύντητα*, and so guided Western speculation along the 'anthropological' path. These assertions are bold, and I find the last one obscure, but the inference seems to be that Western philosophy has spurned Plato and followed in the steps of Protagoras and Aristotle. If this inference be accepted, then we must disregard, as what biologists call a 'mutant', any Western philosophical doctrine which diverges from 'Western philosophy' so defined. And this may help us, perhaps, to understand such twin assertions as that (a) Aristotle's work is Western, and (b) 'in India purpose is looked upon as inherent in any cosmic function, while to us it is a mere accidental, coming to objects from without'. It is fair to say that the bulk of Miss Heimann's short book deals with the salient features of Indian philosophy, and I am not competent to criticize what she says on that subject.

T. M. KNOX.

*University of St. Andrews.*

## CORRESPONDENCE

### THE LOEB DE PARTIBUS ANIMALIUM.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIRS,

Perhaps you can allow me room to supplement Professor Sir D'Arcy Thompson's review of Dr. Peck's edition of Aristotle's *De Partibus*, by drawing attention to the full Introduction, and also to the Foreword contributed by Dr. F. H. A. Marshall, neither of which he has found space to mention.

We non-scientific scholars are grateful to Dr. Marshall for pointing out the importance of this treatise as the earliest text-book of animal

physiology, for indicating the departments of the subject in which Aristotle attained accurate knowledge, and for discussing the teleological aspect of Aristotle's work in this field.

Dr. Peck's introduction is full of useful information clearly set out; some points are original, while on others he acknowledges his debt to Sir D'Arcy Thompson and other authorities. Valuable items are a table of Aristotle's biological and zoological works classified by subject, showing the place of *De Partibus* in the whole scheme; a synopsis of its contents; and a study of a series of technical terms, *μόριον*, *άτιτα*, *λόγος*, *γένεσις*, *δύναμις*, and so on—this will be most useful to beginners, and is not to be ignored by accomplished Aristotelians.

An account is given of the Syrian, Arabic, and Latin versions of Aristotle's zoology, the most detailed short study known to me of the transmission of the Master's work. It is a fascinating story. Among the figures that fit across the screen are Haroun-al-Rashid's son, court physician to the Caliph, Michael Scot, official astrologer to the King of Sicily at Palermo, Grosseteeste, a Suffolk man, Bishop of Lincoln, William of Moerbeke in Flanders, translator for Saint Thomas Aquinas, and the humanist Popes Nicholas V and Sixtus IV. Then we come to Aristotle's influence on the biologists of the Renaissance, especially William

Harvey, and the rediscovery of him later on by Cuvier and St. Hilaire.

In conclusion Dr. Peck makes a noteworthy contribution to textual criticism. Several corrupt passages are restored with the aid of the Arabic and Latin versions—in regard to the British Museum copy of the former Dr. Reuben Levy has lent his aid. In many places Dr. Peck has studied the six MSS of Michael Scot's version that are in England, and the three Oxford copies of William of Moerbeke.

H. RACKHAM.

*Christ's College, Cambridge.*

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to *C.R.* denotes a review or mention in the *Classical Review*.)

### GNOMON.

XIV. 1. JANUARY, 1938.

*Pagasan und Demetrias.* By F. Stählin, E. Meyer, and A. Heidner [Berlin : de Gruyter, 1934. Pp. xi+273, 35 illustrations, 24 plates, 3 maps, 4°] (Fabricius). Heidner's maps and Stählin's descriptions are good; Meyer's historical survey excellent. G. Daux : *Delphes au IIe et au Ier siècle* . . . [C.R. LI. 191] (Klaassenbach). A book of wide learning. K. regrets the absence of adequate indices. A. W. van Buren : *Ancient Rome as revealed by recent discoveries* [C.R. L. 190] (Boethius). Instructive and suggestive. E. Beneviste : *Origines de la formation des noms en Indo-Européen*, vol. I [Paris : Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1935. Pp. 224] (Specht). Sp. is impressed by B.'s method, though he argues against many of his opinions. E. Löfstedt : (1) *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* [C.R. LI. 1]; (2) *Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax* [C.R. LI. 140] (Hofmann). (1) The reprint of this remarkable book is very welcome. (2) It is a pleasure to use a book showing such a mastery of so wide a range of problems. R. Nierhaus : *Strophe und Inhalt im pindarischen Epinikion* [Berlin : Junker und Dünnhaupt, 1936. Pp. 122] (Bischoff). May sometimes be useful, but the argument is uneven and the matter not well arranged. I. Barkan : *Capital punishment in ancient Athens* [C.R. LI. 190] (Volkmann). V. argues against B.'s theory that Athens was humane in her method of exacting death penalties. E. G. E. Lorenz : *Alexander der Große* [Berlin : Hobbing, 1935. Pp. 236, 4 plates] (Berve). Does not claim to be a work of scholarship. H. Ziegler : *Titus Pomponius Atticus als Politiker* [Diss. Munich : New York, 1936. Pp. x+125] (Strasburger). Z.'s thorough and independent examination is valuable for the understanding of Cicero's letters to Atticus. T. Wikström : *In Firmicium Maternum Studia critica* [C.R. L. 89] (Bickel). W. is not an outstanding textual critic, but he makes some interesting observations. G. Wagner : *Hölderlin und die Vorsokratiker* [Würzburg : Triltsch, 1937. Pp. 191] (Venske). This book,

though daring in method, may be counted among the forerunners of a future interpretation of Hölderlin.—Forthcoming books from German publishers.—Obituary notice of Johannes Sykutris by A. Körte.

XIV. 2. FEBRUARY, 1938.

H. Payne and G. M. Young : *Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis* [London : The Cresset Press, 1936. Pp. xiv+75, 140 plates, Fol.] (Lullies). Y.'s photographs and P.'s introduction are of the greatest value. The book marks a new stage in the study of early Attic sculpture. Ch. Hofkes-Bruker : *Frühgriechische Gruppenbildung* [Diss. Würzburg : Triltsch, 1935. Pp. xii+80, 12 plates] (Matz). Lacks system and solidity, but calls attention to some aspects which may prove to be important. R. Naumann : *Der Quellbezirk von Nîmes* [Berlin : de Gruyter, 1937. Pp. vi+60, 50 illustrations, 43 plates] (v. Gerkan). A trustworthy piece of work which opens the way for further study. G. Juhász : *Die Sigillaten von Brigetio* [Budapest : Inst. f. Münzkunde u. Archäol. d. Univ., 1936. Pp. 201 and a volume of 59 plates, 4°] (Dragendorff). Throws some light on ancient culture. A German summary follows the Hungarian text. G. Calogero : *Studi sull' Eleatismo* [Rome : Tip. del Senato, 1932. Pp. 264] (v. Fritz). In a long review v. F. finds much cause for disagreement, but considers that the book deserves study. C. Opheim : *The Aristaeus Episode of Vergil's Fourth Georgic* [C.R. LI. 231] (Seel). Does not advance our knowledge. O. Foerster : *Handschriftliche Untersuchungen zu Senekas Epistularis Morales und Naturales Quaestiones* [Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 1936. Pp. 56, 2 illustrations] (Castiglioni). Careful work, which is fruitful in connexion with the *Ep. M.* but without importance for the textual criticism of the *N.Q.*—Bibliographical Supplement 1938 Nr 1 (down to January 31).

XIV. 3. MARCH, 1938.

Fr. W. König : *Die Stele von Xanthos*. Part 1 : *Metrik und Inhalt* [Vienna : Gerold,

1936] (Olzscha). Too bold in the explanation of individual words, but suggests new lines of thought. J. Kroll: *Theognisinterpretationen* [C.R. LII. 11] (Nestle). K.'s main contentions must win approval even if he is not always convincing in detail. He conclusively refutes Jacoby's theories. W. Müri: *Arzt und Patient bei Hippokrates* [C.R. L. 159] (Diller). Reopens discussion of some important questions and in some respects advances our knowledge. W. Kley: *Theophrasts Metaphysisches Bruchstück und die Schrift Περὶ σημείων in der lateinischen Übersetzung des Bartholomaeus von Messina* [C.R. LII. 16] (Dirlmeier). The potential value of K.'s work is spoilt by much error and bad judgment. K. Schütze: *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Phainomena Arats* [C.R. L. 88] (O'Neill). While disputing many points of detail O.'N. speaks highly of the general character of the dissertation. G. Carlsson: *Eine Denkschrift an Caesar über den Staat* [Lund: Gleerup, 1936. Pp. 128] (Dahlmann). D. attacks the views expressed about the *epistolae ad Caesarem senem de re publica* attributed to Sallust. V. Pöschl: *Römischer Staat und griechisches Staatsdenken bei Cicero* [C.R. LII. 40] (Mack). P.'s view that Cicero wrote the *de re publica* under the influence of Plato is founded on a fanciful interpretation of the evidence. Plutarchi *Moralia*. Vol. II ed. W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, J. B. Titchener [C.R. L. 127] (Castiglioni). Though not fully satisfactory, the volume is welcome for the opportunity given by the apparatus for a critical evaluation of the text. C. makes a number of suggestions. R. Beutler: *Philosophie und Apologie bei Minucius Felix* [Diss. Königsberg, 1936. Pp. 86] (Bickel). The enquiry into sources is not very successful or fruitful. A. Chodacek: *De Prisciani Lydi Solutionum capite VI* [C.R. LII. 148] (de Lorenzi). A cautious and subtle piece of reasoning, but not sufficient to prove the nature of Posidoni's views on tides. G. H. Macurdy: *Vassal-Queens and some contemporary women in the Roman Empire* [C.R. LII. 159] (Hohl). Rather highly coloured, but a welcome sequel to *Hellenistic Queens*. K. Scott: *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians* [C.R. LII. 32] (Taeger). Further work in this sphere must be founded on Scott's book and Sauter's *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius*. J. J. de Jong: *Apologetiek en christendom in den Octavius van Minucius Felix* [C.R. L. 39] (Martin). The author states his case soberly and well. N. H. Baynes: *The political ideas of St. Augustine's De Civitate Dei* [C.R. L. 40] (Fuchs). A pamphlet which lays no claim to originality but is very good of its kind. *Pollucis Onomasticon* ed. E. Bethe. Fasc. 3: *Indices* [C.R. L. 157] (Adler). The indices might be better, but they greatly aid the use of the book.

64] (A. Lesky). L. agrees with most of M.'s interpretations.—Demosthenes, *Private Orations* with an English translation by A. T. Murray. I. [C.R. LII. 176] (C. Rüger). While generally approving, R. criticizes some points in the translation.—Aristotelis *Dialogorum fragmenta in usum scholarum selegit R. Walzer* [Testi della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa II. Florence, 1934] (P. Merlan). An excellent selection. M. criticizes some details.—Philo with an English translation by F. H. Colson. Vol. VI [C.R. L. 148] (O. Stählin). S. criticizes some readings.—R. G. Bury, *Sextus Empiricus* with an English translation. Vol. III [C.R. L. 200] (R. Philippson). P. would have liked the inclusion of the books *Πρὸς μαθηματικούς* and also a more conservative attitude towards the text. The translation is clear and good.—Fr. Dirlmeier, *Die Oikeiosis-Lehre Theophrasts* [C.R. L. 178] (Ph. Merlan). M. approves of the main thesis that Th. anticipated the Stoic doctrine of life according to nature, but criticizes D.'s theory of the development of Peripatetic ethics.—*The Homeric Hymns*, ed. T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday and E. E. Sikes [C.R. L. 217] (S. Lorenz). The cautious text and full commentary make this the best edition. L. would have liked more literary criticism.—H. Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* [C.R. XLIX. 176] (J. Schönemann). S. agrees generally with the views expressed in this book and regrets that, as a knowledge of Greek is essential for its understanding, its influence is necessarily limited.—C. J. de Vogel, *Een Keerpunt in Plato's Denken* [C.R. L. 220] (A. Kraemer). In this important and inspiring work de V. discusses the views of Burnet, Taylor and others and shows in what sense the *Theaetetus* and *Parmenides* may be said to mark a turning-point in P.'s development.

LATIN LITERATURE.—P. C. Knook, *De overgang van metrisch tot rythmisch prosa bij Cyprianus en Hieronymus* [C.R. L. 151] (A. Kraemer). Kr. sums up the results of this instructive investigation.—C. Lenz, *Die wiederholten Verse bei Lukrez* [Dresden, 1937] (M. Schuster). S. agrees with L.'s treatment of 'repetitions' and especially with the view that Book III forms the conclusion of the poem.—J. W. Duff, *Roman Satire* [C.R. LII. 20] (R. Helm). An excellent work by an author thoroughly familiar with his subject.—E. H. Warmington, *Remains of old Latin II* [C.R. L. 71] (A. Klotz). Though many details require correction, W. has in general performed his task well.—W. B. Anderson, *Sidonius, Poems and Letters* with an English translation. Vol. I [C.R. L. 21] (A. Klotz). Even though some of his conjectures are not acceptable A. has contributed in a notable manner to the interpretation of a very difficult author.—J. Svennung, *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und sur lateinischen Fach- und Volksprache* [C.R. L. 19] (J. Köhm). Indispensable for all future work in this department.—*Orasio nella letteratura mondiale* [C.R. L. 229] (R. Helm). Scholars of various countries discuss the influence of H. on their life and literature.—H. Bruckmann, *Die römischen Niederlagen im*

*Geschichtswerk des T. Livius* [Münster, 1936. Pp. 128] (A. Klotz). A valuable contribution to the understanding of L.'s art.—H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Latin Literature* [C.R. L. 246] (A. Klotz). K. finds much to correct.—K. Büchner, *Beobachtungen über Vers und Gedankengang bei Lukrez* [C.R. LI. 179] (M. Schuster). Important book which suggests some new considerations for Lucretian criticism.—B. Altaner, *Der Stand der Isidorforschung. Ein kritischer Bericht über die seit 1910 erschienene Literatur* [Rome, 1936] (P. Heseler). H. makes few additions to this almost complete account.

**HISTORY.**—G. Lemcke, *Die Varusschlacht. Eine Quellenuntersuchung zum Bericht des Florus* [Hamburg, 1936. Pp. 62] (A. Klotz). L. fails to prove that F. is dependent on Velleius.—F. G. Moore, *The Roman's World* [C.R. LI. 108] (K. A. Eichenberg). Provides a broad picture of social, cultural and political conditions.—G. Bloch and J. Carcopino, *Histoire romaine. Tome 2 : La république romaine de 133 à 44 avant J.-C. Des Gracques à Sulla*. J. Carcopino, *César* [C.R. L. 135] (E. Hohl). The industry and learning of C. must be recognized even by those who disagree with some of his views.—E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums. 3. Band : Der Ausgang der altorientalischen Geschichte und der Aufstieg des Abendlandes bis zu den Perserkriegen*. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage, herausgegeben v. H. E. Stier [Cotta, 1937] (Fr. W. Frhr. v. Bissing). Fills the gap from middle of 8th century to Darius. B. criticizes in some respects and hopes that in the additional volume promised recent literature and new discoveries will be included.—H. Ziegler, *Titus Pomponius Atticus als Politiker* [New York, 1936. Pp. 126] (A. Klotz). A cautious attempt to deduce the character of A. from his recorded actions.—L. Berlinger, *Beiträge zur inoffiziellen Titulatur der römischen Kaiser. Eine Untersuchung ihres ideengeschichtlichen Gehaltes und ihrer Entwicklung* [Breslau, 1935] (A. Stein). A work of mature study. Notable is B.'s collection and criticism of earlier opinions.

**PAPYROLOGY.**—*Papyri Osloenses III* ed. S. Eitrem and Leiv Amundsen [C.R. LI. 85] (K. Fr. W. Schmidt). S. expresses gratitude and sums up contents.

**ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANTIQUITIES.**—J. H. Iliffe, *Sigillata Wares in the Near East* [Oxford, 1936. Pp. 50] (A. Lippold). A useful practical work though it does not claim to be exhaustive.—*Metropolitan Museum Studies* V, 2 [New York, 1936] (G. Lippold). Notable is an essay by V. Müller 'The beginnings of monumental sculpture in Greece'.—H. Payne and G. M. Young, *Archaic marble sculpture from the Acropolis. A photographic catalogue* [London, Cresset Press, 1936] (G. Lippold). Useful. P.'s criticism especially valuable.—*The Excavations at Dura-Europos conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions and Letters. Preliminary Report of Sixth Season of Work October 1932–March 1933* ed. by M. I. Rostovtzeff, A. R. Bellinger, C. Hopkins and C. B. Welles [Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, 1936. Pp. xx + 518] (P. Thomsen).

A very careful and thorough description.—N. Åberg, *Vorgeschichtliche Kulturreise in Europa. Bilderatlas mit erläuterndem Text* [Copenhagen, 1936] (H. Philipp). Very valuable exposition with 55 sketch-maps.—P. de La Coste-Messelière, *Au Musée de Delphes* [C.R. LII. 75] (G. Lippold). L. sums up and criticizes some interpretations.

**LANGUAGE.**—J. Werres, *Die Beteuerungsformeln in der attischen Komödie* [C.R. L. 199] (E. Wüst). Valuable but too narrow in scope. J. Svennung, *Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre* [C.R. LI. 141] (J. Köhm). Valuable work founded on careful research.—E. Schwizer, *Griechische Grammatik. I. Lief.* [C.R. XLVIII. 179] (E. Hofmann). A very important book that should be in the hands of all teachers of Greek.—A. Thierfelder, *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Apollonius Dyscolus* [C.R. L. 147] (H. J. Mette). T. shows sober judgment and subtle interpretation. M. differs as regards a few passages.

**MISCELLANEOUS.**—*Athen und Umgebung* [Reiseführer Band 12. Grieben-Verlag, Berlin, 1937. Pp. 167] (G. Soyer). Those interested in ancient or modern Athens will find this an excellent reference book.—R. Froehner, *Die Berliner Prachthandschrift der griechischen Hippocratis* [Berlin u. Solingen : H. Hauptner, Instrumentenfabrik, 1937] (R. Zaunick). Excellent reproduction of 8 pages of the codex with historical sketch by F.—*Atti del III congresso nazionale di studi Romani* (22–29 April 1933) a cura di C. G. Paluzzi [5 vols. Bologna 1935] (G. Lippold). L. gives short summaries of 95 articles.—N. J. Hommes, *Het Testimonialeboek. Studiën over O.T. Citaten in het N.T. en bij de Patres*. Met critische beschouwingen over de theorieën van J. Rendel Harris en D. Plooy (Amsterdam, 1935. Pp. 393) (A. Kraemer). K. reviews the whole question and sums up H.'s successful criticism.—W. Lammers, *Wilhelm v. Humboldt's Weg zur Sprachforschung 1785–1801* [=Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Sprachwiss. I. Berlin, 1936] (J. Schönemann). A generally acceptable sketch disfigured by many mistakes and misprints.—R. Eichenauer, *Musik und Rasse* [Lehmann, Munich] (H. Philipp). Interesting attempt to discover different racial elements in Greek and later music.—H. C. Weiland, *Het Ordeel der Kerkvaders over het Orakel* [C.R. L. 89] (A. Kraemer). An instructive investigation showing that divination was generally condemned as the work of demons. Sometimes a more favourable attitude appears, especially towards the Sibyl.—O. Kern, *Aus dem amtlichen und wissenschaftlichen Briefwechsel von Carl Otfried Müller* [Göttingen, 1936. Pp. xiv + 417] (J. Schönemann). On the whole a good and accurately published selection from M.'s voluminous correspondence.—*Yale Classical Studies*, ed. A. M. Harmon. Vol. V [C.R. L. 48] (W. Ensslin). 4 articles, which E. sums up.

**COMMUNICATIONS.**—Jan. 1, Fr. Walter, *Zu Livius und Velleius Paterculus* (2 pp.).—Jan. 8, L. Fruchtel, *Isidoros von Pelusion als Benutzer des Clemens Alexandrinus u. anderer Quellen*

(2 pp.)—Jan. 22, R. Philippson, *Zu Sextus Empiricus* (2 pp.)—Jan. 29, B. Maurenbrecher, *Zu Hispania und Hispanus* (1 p.)—Feb. 5 and 19, J. K. Schönberger, *Petrus c. 1-5* (3½ pp.)—Feb. 26 and March 5, L. Dittmeyer, *Hat Bartholomaeus von Messina die Rhetorica ad Alexandrum übersetzt?* (3½ + 2 cols.)—March 19, W. J. W. Koster, *De duplii accentu eidem syllabae superscripto* (1½ cols.).

## CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXXI. NOS. 8-17. JANUARY-MARCH, 1938.

(10) *Microphotography and its application to classical scholarship* (R. P. Johnson). Interesting and practical article on the use of films for note-taking and publication.

(11) *The High School Problem* (Editorial), calling attention to an article in the same issue : *Latin and the Smaller Communities* (W. H. Freeman).

(15) *Translated Classics* (H. H. Chamberlin). A plea for verse rather than prose- renderings of classical poetry.

REVIEWS.—(8) Dörpfeld, *Alt-Athen und seine Agora* [pp. viii, 132, 8 pl. Berlin: Mittler, 1937] (T. L. Shear). Antiquated theories; the new archaeological evidence is ignored. Lenz, *Albii Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri Tres* [C.R. LI. 159] (K. P. Harrington). Judgment on the whole conservatively sound. Macurdy, *Vassal-Queens and Some Contemporary Women in the Roman Empire* [C.R. LI. 159] (J. V. A. Fine). Useful as a reference book, though sometimes insufficiently critical. Tanzer, *The Letters of Pliny the Younger* [C.R. LI. 149] (H. R. Clifford). Favourable. de la Coste-Messelière, *Au Musée de Delphes* [C.R. LII. 75] (M. Bieber). On two archaic monuments; packed with useful remarks. Avery, *The Use of Direct Speech in Ovid's Metamorphoses* [C.R. LI. 241], and Herr, *The Additional Short Syllables in Ovid* [pp. 31. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, 1937] (M. A. Grant). Two useful dissertations. Faravelli, *Origine della censura romana* [pp. 48] and *La censura romana di Appio Claudio Cieco* [pp. 17. Como: Nani, 1937] (G. McCracken). The first pamphlet promises a larger work, the second is a not very lucid discussion of the chronological problem.

(9) Whatmough, *The Foundations of Roman Italy* [C.R. LI. 192] (D. O. Robson). Many criticisms, e.g. on 'Keltic movement' in Latin literature. Robinson and Fluck, *A Study of the Greek Love-Names* [C.R. LII. 38] (A. F. Pauli). Adversely criticized; but c. iv. (catalogue of names on Attic vases) is an important contribution. Wall, *A Medieval Latin Version of Demetrius' De Elocutione* [C.R. LI. 160]. (F. R. B. Godolphin). Great industry but rather lacking in insight. Scott and Horn, *Latin Book One* [pp. 448. Chicago: Foresman, 1936] (B. W. Mitchell). Unfavourable. Duffy, *A Comparative Study of the Religion of the Iliad and Odyssey* [pp. ii, 15-68. Privately published: University of Chicago Libraries, 1937] (J. A. Scott). Fundamental agreement

between the two poems; very favourably reviewed.

(10) Jackson, *Tacitus*, vols. III, IV [C.R. LI. 186] (L. E. Lord). Favourable. Heidel, *The Frame of the Ancient Greek Maps* [C.R. LII. 43] (H. E. Burton). Scholarly and convincing, though often speculative. Sinker, *Introduction to Lucretius* [C.R. LI. 179] (C. Murley). Scholarly competent and taste good.

(11) Bugbee, etc., *General Language* [pp. xvi, 500. Boston: Sanborn, 1937] (J. F. Gummere). Latin section severely criticized. Favez, *La consolation latine chrétienne* [pp. 190. Paris: Vrin, 1937] (O. M. Norlie). Scholarly. (1) Theunissen, *Ploutarchos' Leven van Aratos* [pp. xx, 327. Nijmegen: Berkhouw, 1935]; (2) Porter, *Plutarch's Life of Aratus* [C.R. LI. 223]; (3) Koster, *Plutarchi Vita Arati* [C.R. LI. 223] (A. Gudeman). Each has virtues of its own supplementing those of the other two. Rand, *Horace and the Spirit of Comedy* [C.R. LII. 21] (D. M. Robathan). Peppink, *Athenaei Diaphanostistarum Epitome*, part one [C.R. LI. 160] (C. B. Gulick). Welcome. Roser, *Erläuterung und Führung* [pp. ix, 54. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936] (B. L. Trell). A study of the religious views of Socrates and Plato. Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible* [pp. 264. London: Duckworth, 1936] (H. A. Sanders). Excellent; some small slips. Hege and Rodenwaldt, *Olympia* [pp. 54, 52 figs., 94 pls. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1936] (S. N. Deane). Illustrations of notable quality, with interesting introduction; designed for the layman.

(12) (1) Buchan, *Augustus* [pp. xvii, 379. Boston: Mifflin, 1937]; (2) Allen, *Augustus Caesar* [C.R. LI. 194] (B. C. Clough). (1) Admirably adapted to the general reader but interesting also to the scholar. (2) Sound but dull. Schmidt, *Excavations at Tepe Hissar, Damghan* [pp. xxii, 478. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1937] (J. Johnson). Sumptuous report of important excavation of a North-Iranian mound. Oesterley and Robinson, *Hebrew Religion* [pp. 448. Macmillan, 1937-2nd edition] (R. Marcus). Its merits outweigh its defects; M. gives an interesting list of both. Kroymann, *Sparta und Messenia* [C.R. LII. 28] (L. R. Sher). Cumulative effect of the arguments impressive. Ranke, *The Art of Ancient Egypt* [pp. 22, 341 illustrations. Oxford University Press, 1936] (L. Bull). Excellent reproductions with readable historical survey. Poteat, *Selected Letters of Pliny* [C.R. LII. 48] (A. P. Dorjahn). Praised. Norvin, *Olympiodori philosophi in Platonis Gorgiam commentatoria* [C.R. LI. 204] (P. de Lacy). An improvement on Jahn, but there are indications of a pervasive carelessness in method. Washburn and others, *Master Bronzes* [pp. 258, 173 figs. Buffalo: Albright Art Gallery, 1937] (W. R. Agard). Beautiful catalogue of pieces from American collections. Herron, *A Study of the Clausulae in the Writings of St. Jerome* [C.R. LI. 202] (J. L. Heller). Spoiled by metrical and statistical errors.

(13) Willrich, *Perikles* [C.R. L. 191] (L. Pearson). Praised, though too dogmatic or uncritical in parts. Avery, *The Exultet Rolls of South Italy* [pp. 54, 206 plates. Princeton

University Press, 1937] (L. W. Jones). Will advance our knowledge of medieval drawing and painting. Rivier, *La vie d'Achille* [pp. vii, 145, 51 figs. Lausanne : Payot, 1936] (D. B. Thompson). Selection of Homeric passages, illustrated from vases. Petrie, *Palestine and Israel* [pp. x, 99, 16 plates. London : S.P.C.K., 1934] (J. Starr).

(14) Otto, *Handbuch der Archäologie* [C.R. LII. 33] (A. D. Fraser). Favourable. Kowalski, *De Arte Rhetorica I* [C.R. LII. 18] (H. Caplan). Enlarges our knowledge of the origins of rhetoric. Robinson, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* [C.R. LII. 47] (G. M. A. Richter). Praised ; some minor criticisms.

(15) Gelzer, *Die Schrift vom Staate der Athener* [C.R. LII. 27] (O. W. Reinmuth). Well written and closely reasoned. Vandvik, *Rhythmus und Metrum* [C.R. LII. 18] (W. E. Blake). Sensible discussion of a problem which can never be authoritatively solved. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament* [pp. 362. Chicago : University Press, 1937], Lake, *An Introduction to the New Testament* [pp. 302. New York : Harper, 1937], Feine, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* [pp. 326. Leipzig : Quelle und Meyer, 1936] (F. W. Gingrich). The first of these three books is the most readable ; the last amazingly complete. Waterman, etc., *Preliminary Report of the University of Michigan Excavations at Sepphoris* [pp. xii, 86, 30 pls. Michigan University Press, 1937] (W. F. Albright). Praised except for details. Zuntz, *Die hethitischen Ortsadverbien* [pp. 120. Speyer : Pilger, 1936] (B. Schwartz). Valuable for Hittite and comparative syntax. Bignone, *L'Aristotele perduto e la formazione filosofica di Epicuro* [2 vols. pp. 410, 633. Florence, 1936] (N. W. DeWitt). Notable synthesis of work on Epicurus with illuminating results. Diehl, *Théodora, Impératrice de Byzance* [pp. 314. Paris : de Boccard, 1937] (A. Vasiliev). A reprint of the book of 1904.

(16) Sutherland, *Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain* [C.R. LI. 208] (A. R. Bellinger). A notable contribution though principles and conclusions are not always clearly stated. Hett and Rackham, *Aristotle, Problems and Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* [C.R. LI. 221] (J. P. Pritchard). Hett's translation is satisfactory and, for the most part, accurate ; Rackham's is excellent. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* [3 vols. pp. 377, 462, 406. Columbia University Press, 1937] (F. M. Heichelheim). Praised ; reviewer makes

some corrections and additions. Gordziejew, *Ludi scaenici et circenses quid in rebus publicis antiquorum valuerint* [pp. 113. Warsaw, 1936] (W. B. McDaniel). Scholarly treatment of political allusions in Greek and Roman drama. Latsch, *Die Chronologie der Satiren und Epoden des Horaz* [pp. 117. Würzburg : Mayr, 1936] (J. J. Savage). Thorough and useful. Graf, *Kaiser Vespasian* [C.R. LI. 195] (J. C. Rolfe). Favourable. Hampe, *Frühe griechische Sagenbilder in Böiotien* [pp. 112, 42 pls., 32 figs. Athens : Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1936] (H. R. W. Smith). Ingenious and suggestive, but marred by impetuosity. Battelli, *Lezioni di paleografia* [pp. 227. Rome : Pont. Scuola Vaticana di Paleografia, 1936] (E. A. Lowe). Builds on Traube ; a step towards a really modern textbook.

(17) Dudley, *A History of Cynicism* [pp. 224. London : Methuen, 1937] (F. Solmsen). Very favourable ; though there is too little about social background. Hitti, *History of the Arabs* [pp. 767. Macmillan, 1937] (J. Starr). Sound throughout, save in presenting Arabia as the fount of Semitic culture. Boyancé, *Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecs* [pp. 375. Paris : de Boccard, 1937] (E. Riess). Contains many acute remarks, though he fails to make good his general contentions. Rat, *Anthologie des poètes latins* [2 vols. pp. 740, 673. Paris : Garnier, 1937] (D. P. Lockwood). Admirably chosen ; the selections are rendered in clear French prose. Helm, *Die Pseudo-Virgilische Ciris* [pp. 65. Heidelberg : Winter, 1937] (A. Gudeman). Detailed proofs of non-Virgilian authorship, with a new recension of the text. Bittel, *Die Ruinen von Bogasköy* [pp. 107, 63 figs., 3 plans. Berlin : de Gruyter, 1907] (V. Müller). Highly recommended as a description of the ruins and an introduction to Hittite history. *Gli Studi Romani nel Mondo*, III [pp. 381, 52 pls. Rome, 1936] (G. McCracken). Eighteen lectures delivered at the Istituto di Studi Romani in 1935. Flacelière, *Plutarchus, Sur les oracles de la Pythie* [C.R. LII. 67] (W. C. Helmbold). Text, translation and apparatus very inaccurate ; introduction the most valuable part of the book. Nybakkene, *An Analytical Study of Horace's Ideas* [C.R. LI. 230] (J. O. Moseley). A fine service for the student of Horace.

All the numbers contain 'Abstracts of Articles' and 'Recent Publications'. There are some 'Shorter Notices' in (8), (13), (14), and 'In the Classroom' appears in (9), (11), (13), (14), (16).

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.  
\* \* \* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Abramowicz (S.) *Etudes sur les hymnes homériques*. Pp. 96. Wilno : Sw. Wojciech (for the Society of Friends of Learning), 1937. Paper.

Acheson (G. J.) *Agricola*. An English version of a Roman tale. Pp. vii + 100. London : Macmillan, 1938. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Alföldi (A.) *A Festival of Isis in Rome under*

the Christian Emperors of the IVth Century. Pp. 95; 20 plates. Budapest: Institute of Numismatics and Archaeology of the Pázmány University (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1937. Paper, P. 25 (bound, 28).

*Allen* (H. M.), *Garrod* (H. W.) Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami. Tom. IX. 1530-1532. Pp. xxiv+497. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 28s.

*Altheim* (F.) A History of Roman Religion. Translated by H. Mattingly. Pp. xi+548. London: Methuen, 1938. Cloth, 21s.

*Andrew* (S. O.) The Wrath of Achilles. Translated from Iliad I, XI, XVI-XXIV, with a note on the metre. Preface by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. Pp. x+226. London: Dent, 1938. Cloth, 6s.

*Banti* (L.) Luni. Pp. 202; 30 plates. Florence: Istituto di Studi Etruschi, 1937. Paper.

*Barnes* (A. S.) Christianity at Rome in the Apostolic Age. Pp. xv+222. London: Methuen, 1938. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

*Barrett* (U. S.) and *Johnston* (J. H. O.) The Aeneid of Vergil. Books I-IX translated by U. S. B., Books X-XII by J. H. O. J. Pp. 444. Pretoria: van Schaik, 1937. Cloth, 15s.

*Björk* (G.) Der Fluch des Christen Sabinus. Papyrus Upsaliensis 8. Pp. 165; 2 plates. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell (Cambridge: Heffer), 1938. Paper, 6 kr.

*Blake* (W. E.) Chariton Aphrodisiensis de Chaerea et Callirhoe amatoriarum narrationum libri octo. Recensuit et emendavit W. E. B. Pp. xx+142. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

*Boas* (M.) Alcuin and Cato. Pp. 60. Leiden: Brill, 1937. Paper, f. 1.25.

*Böhme* (R.) Das Prooimion, eine Form sakraler Dichtung der Griechen. Pp. 88. Bühl (Baden): Konkordia-A.G., 1937. Paper.

*Buchan* (J.) Julius Caesar. Pp. 170; 1 map. London: Nelson, 1938. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

*Buscaroli* (C.) Perfidum ridens Venus. L'ode III 27 di Orazio con versione ritmica ed esegesi. Pp. 76. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1937. Paper, L. 10.

*Chalmers-Hunt* (D. R.) Buried Bethlehem. A New Guide to Holy Places in Palestine. Part I. Pp. iv+47; illustrations. Canterbury: Historical Research Publishing Co., 1937. Paper, 5s.

*Clark* (K. W.) A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America. Pp. xxix+418; 73 plates. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1937. Cloth, 22s. 6d.

*Collart* (P.) Philippi, ville de Macédoine, depuis ses origines jusqu'à la fin de l'époque romaine. Pp. xi+558, bound in paper, with 88 plates in a portfolio. (École Française d'Athènes, Travaux et Mémoires, Fasc. V.) Paris: de Boccard, 1937.

*Comparetti* (D.) Virgilio nel Medio Evo. Nuova edizione a cura di G. Pasquali. Vol. I. Pp. xxxiv+293. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia'. Paper, L. 26 (bound, 32).

*Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*. Supplementum II. Galeni de causis proctoarctitis libellus . . . Ad codicium fidem recensuit in Graecum sermonem retro vertit K. Barlong. Pp. xxxiv+64. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1937. Paper, (export price) RM. 4.65.

*Diels* (H.) Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Griechisch und deutsch von H. D. Fünfte Auflage herausgegeben von W. Kranz. Dritter Band, Lieferungen 9, 10 (Schlusslieferung). S. 337-654. Berlin: Weidmann, 1938. Paper.

*Dioniso*. Bollettino dell'Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico. Vol. VI—n. 3. Syracuse, 1937. L. 5.

*Dow* (S.) Prytaneis. A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors. Pp. 258; illustrations. (The American Excavations in the Athenian Agora. Hesperia: Supplement I.) Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1937. Paper, \$3.

*Ekels* (R. P.) Greek Wolf-lore. Pp. 88. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1937. Paper.

*Ernout* (A.) Plaute. Tome V. Mostellaria—Persa—Poenulus. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 40 fr.

*Farrington* (B.) The Civilisation of Greece and Rome. Pp. 95. (The New People's Library, Vol. VIII.) London: Gollancz, 1938. Cloth, 1s. 6d. (paper, 1s.)

*Gagnor* (A.) Florilegium Gallicum. Untersuchungen und Texte zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Florilegienliteratur. Pp. 247; 2 plates. (Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societen i Lund, 18.) Lund: Gleerup, 1936. Paper, 10 kr.

*Gardner* (E. A.) Greece and the Aegean. New Edition revised by S. Casson. Pp. 261; illustrations, maps and plans. London: Harrap, 1938. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

*Gosling* (W. F.) A Basic Latin Vocabulary. Pp. 128. London: University of London Press, 1938. Limp cloth, 2s.

*Graves* (R.) Count Belisarius. Pp. x+527; 5 maps. London etc.: Cassell, 1938. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

*Hampf* (F.) Die griechischen Staatsverträge des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Christi Geb. Pp. vii+144. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1938. Paper, M. 6.

*Heinze* (R.) Vom Geist des Römeriums. Ausgewählte Aufsätze herausgegeben von E. Burck. Pp. v+296. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1938. Cloth, (export price) RM. 5.40.

*Hesperia*. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. VI: No. 4. Pp. 570; figures and plates. Vol. VII: No. 1. Pp. 160; figures and plates. Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1937, 1938.

*Higham* (T. F.) and *Bowra* (C. M.) The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation. Pp. cxii+781. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

*Higgin* (G.) Beginning Latin. Pp. xix+326; maps and illustrations. Oxford: Blackwell. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

*Household* (H. W.) Rome: Republic and Empire. Vol. II: The Empire. Pp. xi+316; 2 maps. London: Dent, 1938. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

*Iordăchescu* (Pr. C.), *Simenschy* (Th.) *Sancti Gregorii Nysseni Contra Fatum. Text editat.* Pp. 26. Chișinău: Tipografia Uniunii Clericilor Ortodocși din Basarabia, 1938. Paper, lei 46.

*Jacomb* (E.) *The Lamp of Epictetus. Being Arrian's Lectures to Young Men Paraphrased into Modern English.* Pp. xv+320. London: Methuen, 1938. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

*Klassieke Bibliographie.* 9e Jahrgang. Utrecht: 1938. Boards.

*Laidlaw* (W. A.) *The Prosody of Terence. A Relational Study.* Pp. vii+138. (St. Andrews University Publications, No. XL.) London: Milford, 1938. Boards, 5s.

*Lawrence* (Sir A.) *Aliunde. Translations and Verses.* Pp. vii+118. London: Milford, 1938. Cloth, 5s.

*Lesky* (A.) *Die griechische Tragödie.* Pp. viii+258; 4 illustrations. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Kröner, 1938. Cloth, RM. 2.75.

*Lichtigfeld* (A.) *Twenty Centuries of Jewish Thought.* Pp. 168. London: Edward O. Beck. Paper, 2s. 6d.

*Mackail* (J. W.) *Studies in Humanism.* Pp. ix+271. London: Longmans, 1938. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

*Mahr* (A. C.) *The Origin of the Greek Tragic Form. A Study of the Early Theater in Attica.* Pp. xviii+247; 37 figures. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1938. Cloth, \$3.

*Marg* (W.) *Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühhellenistischen Dichtung (Semonides Homer Pindar).* Pp. iv+105. (Kieler Arbeiten zur klassischen Philologie, Heft 1.) Würzburg: Tritsch, 1938. Paper, M. 3.

*Marouzeau* (J.) *L'année philologique. Bibliographie critique et analytique de l'antiquité gréco-latine.* Publiée sous la direction de J. M. par J. Ernst. Tome XI. Bibliographie de l'année 1936 et complément des années antérieures. Pp. xxiv+447. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1937. Paper, 75 fr.

*Marrou* (H.-I.) *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique.* Pp. xvi+620. (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fasc. 145.) Paris: de Boccard, 1938. Paper.

*Moore* (R. W.) *The Romans in Britain. A selection of Latin texts with a commentary.* Pp. xii+214; map and 7 illustrations. London: Methuen, 1938. Cloth, 6s.

*Newby* (J. D.) *A Numismatic Commentary on the Res Gestae of Augustus.* Pp. xvi+117; 4 plates. Edmond, Oklahoma, U.S.A.: Central State Teachers College, 1938. Paper, \$3.50 postpaid.

*Percy Gardner* 1846-1937. Pp. 13. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXIII.) London: Milford. Paper, 1s.

*Platnauer* (M.) *The Plays of Euripides. Iphigenia in Tauris, edited with introduction and commentary by M. P.* Pp. xxi+186. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 6s.

*Powell* (J. E.) *A Lexicon to Herodotus.* Pp. xi + 392. Cambridge: University Press, 1938. Cloth, 42s.

*Pratt* (F.) *Hail, Caesar!* Pp. 349; maps and illustrations. London: Williams and Norgate, 1938. Cloth, 15s.

*Quantulacumque. Studies Presented to Kir-sopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends.* Pp. viii+367; plates. London: Christophs. Cloth, 21s.

*Rand* (E. K.) *A Toast to Horace.* Pp. 41. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1937. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

*Sas* (L. F.) *The Noun Declension System in Merovingian Latin.* Pp. xx+531. Paris (printed by Impressions Pierre André), 1937. Paper, 50 fr.

*Shearling* (W.) *Greek and Latin Versions.* Pp. III. London: Dent, 1938. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

*Simenschy* (Th.) *Gramatica limbii latine. Ediția a IV-a.* Pp. xvi+225. Chișinău: Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului, 1937. Paper, Lei 84.

*Stevens* (G. P.) *The Periclean Entrance Court of the Acropolis of Athens.* Pp. ix+78; frontispiece and 66 figures. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1936. Cloth, \$2.50.

*Stokoe* (H. R.) *The Understanding of Syntax.* Pp. x+274. London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

*Strzelecki* (L.) *De Flavio Capro Nonii auctore.* Pp. 39. (Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego, T. LXV nr. 3.) Cracow: Nakładem Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności, 1936. Paper.

*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.* Vol. VIII. Fasc. 1. Pp. vii+64. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1937. Paper, fl. 8.

*Thompson* (W. H.), *Tracy* (H. L.), *Dugit* (R. A.) *Essential Latin.* Pp. xvii+514; illustrations. London: Harrap, 1938. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

*Wallace* (S. LeR.) *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian.* Pp. xi+512. (Princeton University Studies in Papyrology, No. 2.) Princeton: Princeton University Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, 25s.

*Webster* (T. B. L.) *Four Greek Vases in the Manchester Museum.* Pp. 19; 5 plates. (Notes from the Manchester Museum, No. 39. Museum Publication 114.) 1937. Paper, 6d.

*Wright* (F. A.) *Three Roman Poets. Plautus, Catullus, Ovid. Their Lives, Times and Works.* Pp. xi+268. London: Routledge, 1938. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

*Wüst* (F. R.) *Philipp II von Makedonien und Griechenland in den Jahren von 346 bis 338.* Pp. x+189. (Münchener Historische Abhandlungen, 1. Reihe, 14. Heft.) Munich: Beck, 1938. Paper, (export price) RM. 6.

# THE ALPHA CLASSICS

*A New Series of Greek and Latin Texts*

GENERAL EDITOR: R. C. CARRINGTON, M.A., D.Phil.  
Headmaster of St. Olaves School

An attractive new series of Greek and Latin texts carefully designed to meet modern ideas of classical teaching. The Introductions aim at being succinct, relevant and suggestive, and have in view the needs of the teacher who wants an indication of the new light thrown on his subject but has little time for private research. In the Notes the main emphasis is laid on subject-matter rather than on syntax and grammar. Each volume contains 12 plates finely reproduced on art paper. The needs of School Certificate candidates have been kept in mind throughout, and each volume has a full vocabulary. First volumes:

**Cæsar's Invasions of Britain.** *Livy: Book V.* Edited by J. E. Pickstone, M.A. 2s.

Edited by R. C. Carrington, M.A.,  
D.Phil. 2s.

**Cicero's Speeches for Marcellus and Ligarius.** Edited by J. Paterson, M.A. 2s.

**Vergil's Aeneid: Books III & IX.**  
Edited by R. W. Moore, M.A., and B. Tilly, M.A. 2s. each.

**Euripides' Hecuba.** Edited by F. W. King, B.A. 2s. 6d.

**Xenophon's Anabasis: Book II.**  
Edited by R. E. Snaith, M.A. 2s.

## NEW LATIN COURSE

By E. C. MARCHANT, M.A., and G. WATSON, M.A.

This new course by these experienced and well-known authors combines the old well-proved study of grammar with modern methods of approach. Text and illustrations have been designed to help learners to realize from the beginning that the ancient Romans were human beings with many interests like our own. The grammar is unfolded gradually throughout the book and is summarised in tables at the end. In view of its paramount importance the elementary syntax of the verb is introduced at an early stage. Collections of miscellaneous sentences have been avoided, and even from the start the exercises deal with some central story or topic. English-Latin exercises alternate with Latin-English and are of approximately the same length. No exercises contain more than ten new words—thus there is frequent revision of vocabulary.

*Fully illustrated by drawings, maps and photographs*

Price 3s.

G. BELL & SONS, LTD.  
YORK HOUSE, PORTUGAL STREET, W.C. 2

# A LEXICON TO HERODOTUS

By J. E. POWELL

42s. net

This work is both lexicon and index. It is an index in so far as it notes every occurrence of every word or name used by Herodotus, *kai* alone excepted; and it is a lexicon in the sense that all words are translated and the references classified by meaning and construction.

# THE GREEKS IN BACTRIA & INDIA

By W. W. TARN

30s. net

Here is to be found the story of eastern Iran and northern India under Greek rule, treated not as part of the history of India, as it has always been, but restored to its proper place in Hellenistic history. Dr Tarn's sources include fragments of lost histories—Greek, Indian, and Chinese—coins, and the evidence of excavations.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS